The LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY

JULY, 1929

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT[1]

ADOLF DEISSMANN
UNIVERSITY OF BERLIN

The New Testament has a double character: it is a collection of the written memorials of Early Christianity, and it is the Holy Book of Christianity today; it is handed down to us in a dead language, and it is translated today into hundreds of living languages; it is put in our libraries, and it is laid on our altars; it is the object of the minute criticism of experts, and it satisfies hungry souls; it is a mine of historical information, and it is a source of religious power, it is of the past, and it is also of the present.

Because of this double character, the question of the value of the New Testament has also a double aspect. It concerns the historical value of the New Testament and also its religious value.

I cannot within the limits of this lecture, plunge into the important question whether or not the religious value of a Biblical text does depend on the results of historical criticism. It may be sufficient today to say that I personally do not think that history is the basis of the holy. I become more and more convinced of the primacy and the autonomy of the holy.

1 A lecture delivered at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., Mar. 21, 1929. This lecture, included in a more extended series, will be published in Oct. 1929, by Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., Garden City, N. Y. The title of the book will be, *The New Testament in the Light of Modern Research.*

Therefore I am of the opinion that we should not overestimate the bearing of historical investigation upon the religious valuation of the New Testament. But this does not mean, of course, any depreciation of the subject of this lecture itself. The problem of the historical value of the New Testament is certainly one of the greatest problems of modern theology.

Now my attitude toward the problem of the historical reliability of the New Testament is strongly influenced by two considerations, which appear to me more and more important, and which have been part of the background of my theological work. I explained them in the previous lectures. First I have emphasized that the New Testament contains a great number of texts which are non-literary in character, especially the Pauline letters; and secondly that the great majority of the New Testament texts are of a more or less popular character. Many liberal and conservative critics have treated the letters of Paul as if they were literary compositions, and have treated the New Testament as a whole as a collection of more or less theological art productions.

In particular the popular character of the Gospels has not been recognized by many people. They have treated these popular books as the product of certain theological tendencies. There are eccentric persons to be found who regard the Gospels as the inventions of anonymous authors of the Imperial period, and deny the historicity of Jesus.

It is remarkable that in these problems of religious history the eccentrics and the dilettantes have such a great number of adherents. Long before Arthur Drews, the statement "Jesus has not existed" belonged to the standing stock of agitators, especially in European labor circles. The argument is always the same; if Jesus had really existed the pagan historians of the Roman Imperial period must have mentioned him; there must be non-Christian accounts in addition to the Gospel traditions; the Christian traditions alone have no value.

Now we can say first of all that Jesus has not been ignored by pagan authors. He is also mentioned in the old Jewish texts, and besides the Gospels we have a quite different group of early Christian sources, especially the letters of Paul. But for my part I would answer these objections with reference to the fact that Early Christianity was a religious movement among the lower classes, at first a small hidden mustard seed. The men of literature, on the whole aristocratic, had they noticed it in the period of its beginnings, would not have mentioned it, regarding it as a despicable, proletarian movement. But, as a rule, they did not even notice it in the time of its beginnings.

Thus the fact that even later on Early Christianity was only seldom mentioned by pagan authors is simply due to its social structure. The Gospels are not quoted in the Graeco-Roman literature just because these thin, modest little books were never found on the bookstalls of the capitals, but like a kind of secret literature they were hidden in the houses of those unknown people who with a few exceptions composed the Christian brotherhoods. Anatole France in one of his narratives has with the poet's intuition fully recognized this fact.

With reference to the social structure of Early Christianity as it is still reflected clearly in the language of the Greek Gospels, we must add that it is as unthinkable that what we call Jesus and Early Christianity came up from these circles automatically, as that Christianity was invented in one of the studies of the ancient world. It is easy to understand that the religious movement of the Gospel was rooted among the lower classes; but that it originated of itself among the anonymous men of these classes, and that afterwards the name "Jesus" was affixed to it like a mummy label is unbelievable. For the historian it is only natural that behind this magnificent religious development there lay a power, the power of a great religious personality.

But on this account we must observe carefully the Gos-

pel tradition and see whether it justifies our faith in it. For this purpose, in agreement with the great majority of scholars from all countries, I distinguish the first three Gospels, the "Synoptic" Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke, as a special group from the Fourth Gospel of John, and I will consider each of these groups separately.

How far are the Synoptic Gospels historically reliable? We must not be prejudiced against the historical value of the Synoptic Gospels just because we are not absolutely certain of the authors nor of the year they were composed, or because certain other questions relative to their origin must be left open. For the estimation of the historical value of the tradition of the words and work of Jesus it is not essential to know whether they were recorded by an Apostle or by another Christian, or to know whether they were written in 40 or in 60 A. D. It depends entirely on whether the inner probability of their whole character and of the details merit our belief in them.

The external evidence compared with that of many other ancient historical texts is certainly very good. Last winter in our Berlin Greek Society called "Graeca" we began to study Arrian's Anabasis of Alexander the Great, and Dr. Ulrich Wilcken gave us a fine introduction, especially examining the question of the sources used by Arrian who wrote in the second century A. D. Then I was deeply impressed by the fact that between Alexander and the writing of those of his biographies which are still in our hands, there lies a very long interval, all contemporary biographers being lost and only accessible to us by occasional quotations in later books.

Compared with these conditions of the Alexander tradition the Jesus tradition is very near to the facts themselves. From an originally oral tradition which later became fixed in writing, the Synoptic gospels were composed in their present form about a generation after the death of Jesus. That we deal here with the tradition of the community does not detract from its value, for all traditions concerning spiritual movements are in their oldest forms traditions of the adherents, traditions of the re-

spective communities. And the nature of the personality of the founder of a community can be best ascertained from his followers.

But although the external facts are so favorable, it must be said that the historical value of the Synoptic Gospels can only be ascertained through internal criticism. Internal criticism is always difficult, and its secret is only revealed to the expert who has spent long years on the investigation of the sources. Although internal criticism strives for objective facts yet it must be borne in mind that there is in it always a subjective element, and one must always be conscious of the relativity of historical knowledge.

Our critical conclusion will not be based on general hypotheses of the circumstances of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels. It is not advisable to form a general and hasty conclusion. It must be a conclusion formed from close investigation of each single part. I certainly accept the theory that the Gospel of Mark is the earliest of the preserved gospels and that the authors of the other two Synoptic Gospels used beside that of Mark one or more records which were composed chiefly of the sayings of Jesus. But I cannot make a definite decision and say that this one or that one of the three Synoptic Gospels as such contains the best tradition. I would not take the early date of the Gospel of Mark as a reason for regarding in all cases its tradition as the most reliable. I would rather consider that not only the single pericopes, but also the single sayings of Jesus have had their own separate history in the oral and written tradition, and I believe that the chief task of the Synoptic study is to ascertain which of these separate traditional texts of the pericopes appears to be primary. This method may be called "synoptic eclecticism." I think Johannes Weiss coined the word. To be sure it is not a beautiful title but it signifies what I hold to be correct. I consider the whole tradition of the Synoptics as one coherent group of ancient texts,

which was handed down with many variants, and I believe it can be said that in many cases it is possible to work back from a tertiary and secondary text to a primary tradition, to an "Urtext."

In the critical testing, especially of the several sayings of Jesus, attention should be given to the following possibilities: 1) that the tradition is intact and trustworthy, 2) that in the course of time it has been shortened, expanded or altered in some way or other, namely either through mere accident during its eventful history, or through the temper of popular religion, or through unconscious or conscious adaptation to the requirements of the Apostolic Christ-cult.

In many cases even a hasty comparison of the variants of a certain passage will show clear traces of the alteration of the originals due to one or more of the causes enumerated.

In the attempt to solve the problem which of the different traditions is the primary we must dismiss all doctrinaire presuppositions. In particular, with the sayings of Jesus we must be on our guard against suspecting the peculiar and the paradoxical. Those sayings of Jesus which disconcert the commonplace intelligence of the dilettante by their paradoxes prove in the proper psychological test to be genuine.

When Julius Wellhausen belittled the historicity of the collection of sayings of Jesus (the so-called source "Q") and in that way the historical value of the Gospels of Luke and Matthew as compared with that of Mark, because a considerable part of the material was the deposit of the beliefs of the community, he overrated the trustworthiness of his own method of historical and literary criticism and underrated the ability of the community to inform itself concerning its own origin. When other scholars denying the historicity of Jesus declare that the Synoptic sayings of Jesus hang in the air, and attribute them to an unknown man, in an uncertain period, in unknown circumstances, strictly all they have done is to erase the nomen proprium, Ἰησοῦς from the tradition.

But even if the name is erased the facts remain, and behind them the creative personality. Then we must discover the creative power which we hitherto called Jesus in this or in that unknown. To make the sayings of Jesus anonymous which is the characteristc of this hypothesis does not help in any way to solve the historical problems. It only puts the Synoptic problem or part of it into the utmost darkness, into a company of anonymous prophets, thinkers and poets, a community of unknown men in an unknown place in an unknown period, wholly inaccessible to the investigator.

The fact ascertained by sane investigation, bewailed by the faint-hearted, disputed by apologists and ridiculed by unbelief, the fact that our earliest tradition of Jesus, the Synoptic tradition, often divides into two or three branches, is for a calm historical judgment an argument for authenticity of the greatest importance. There must be a theme behind the variants and the theme depends on a master who created it. A sensitive internal criticism of the variants enables us very often to ascertain the early stages of the variation, and to work back from the variation to the theme and to the Master.

If I am allowed to indicate my general conclusion, attained through many years of work, it is this: The Synoptic Gospels are great treasure houses with a rich abundance of genuine reminiscences of Jesus. Side by side with the genuine there are others whose genuineness is doubtful or denied. But even those pictures of Christ which were created by the sincere art of his disciples have their value as memorials of the Apostolic Christ-cult and are therefore evidence for the powerful influence of the personality of Christ on his followers.

Summing up: we cannot regard the Synoptic Gospels as one homogeneous group of the same historical value; we must not overlook the different strata. Tertiary and secondary strata lie over the primary. But the primary can be ascertained in many cases.

Through the entire stratification runs the golden vein

of the sayings of Jesus. The fact that the Synoptic tradition is also a tradition of miracles does not detract from the historical value of its tradition. That the Gospels are not merely a collection of sayings but also narratives of miracles was an historical necessity. The Roman historians of the same period not only give accounts of miracles which in their contents are much more grotesque than those of the Gospels, but they were themselves believers in miracles, Livy, Tacitus, and still more Suetonius. It would have been astonishing and even suspicious, if no richly coloured pictures of the marvellous works of the Saviour had been included in the Gospel texts, in books whose existence is due to the requirements of the Apostolic Christ-cult.

Each miracle account of the Synoptics requires special investigation. But when a number of these miracle stories are regarded for strong reasons as secondary, that does not detract from the historical value of the tradition of the Synoptics as a whole.

Here it is necessary to lay particular emphasis on one fact: among the hundreds of sayings of Jesus which have been preserved by the Synoptic Evangelists only a very small number are organically connected with a miracle account, either as preparation for a miracle, or as the result of a miracle, or referring to a past miracle. Thus the tradition of the sayings is very loosely connected with the tradition of miracles, and criticism of the one does not necessarily affect the other.

Using the modern terminology of the historical method, the Synoptic tradition as a whole contains both remains of the history of Jesus and tradition of the history of Jesus. By remains, we are to understand those parts which have remained comparatively unaltered. In the very first rank are those sayings of Jesus which have been preserved in the original Aramaic. But practically we can add the great majority of the sayings of Jesus in Greek. Besides the remains are the traditions. By tradition, we mean a more or less subjective information about Jesus. On the whole the remains, in the narrow or

in the wide sense of the word, seem to me to occupy the foreground in the Synoptic texts.

The remains of the history of Jesus, in particular, the many genuine words of Jesus which we have in the Synoptics, are, it is true, not sufficient to form a biography, but they give us the main outlines of his character, his inner life, and I believe that it is far more important for us to know the soul of Jesus than to know the succession of the external facts of his life.

The Gospel of John is much more a book of cult confessions than the first three Gospels. It gives, for example, to the sayings and the miracles a much closer mutual connection than they have in the Synoptics. In the Fourth Gospel the miracle very often is but the starting-point for great revelations of higher things, as I said before. I am convinced it is the work of a personal disciple of Jesus, who later came under the predominant influence of Pauline Christ-mysticism and the Pauline Christ-cult. He gained a wealth of deep experiences of Christ through a long life lived in spiritual fellowship with the exalted Christ. This spiritual experience of Christ and his own recollections probably strengthened by the knowledge of the Synoptic Gospels formed one organic unity. Thus his Gospel revealed to the churches both recollections of Jesus and the power of Christ.

What is the significance of these facts for the historical value of the Gospel of John? If we again employ the distinction between remains and tradition, we can say: although remains of the history of Jesus are not wanting altogether in the Gospel of John, yet it is cult-tradition, transmitted through the medium of the personality of the author which composes the greater part of the Johannine texts. As a book of cult confessions the Gospel of John is a source of first rate importance for the history of Apostolic Christianity. But it is also of great value for the history of Jesus. Firstly, in those parts which are to be regarded as remains, and secondly, as a peculiar in-

direct source. The Gospel of John also indicates the great influence of the historical personality of Jesus on the Apostolic church, and even where it contains no remains we see behind the Christ-confessions the historical personality of Jesus.

The Acts of the Apostles has also a double character. Here also there is incorporated material which came from the author's own memory, namely the so-called "We"-narratives, and those which were familiar to him of the Apostolic tradition. The historical value of this last material is considerable, although Luke is not a critical historian in the modern sense of the word. But his own recollections are of an extraordinary value not only for the history of Early Christianity but also for the history of culture in the Roman Imperial period. Because Luke himself did not stand in the midst of the events, but was only a collaborator of Paul in some periods and scenes, he is to be corrected in some of his accounts from the letters of Paul. He did not know the contents of the Pauline letters; they were still unpublished when he wrote. But he perfects our knowledge admirably in many cases especially concerning Paul. On the whole, this oldest Church history for those who read it rightly, is indispensable to the proper understanding of the Apostolic period.

We need not say much about the historical value of the Pauline letters. As the self-evidence of the great Apostolic missionary they are the classical sources for the events of his life and for the appreciation of his inner life. In addition, they throw important light on the historical figure of Jesus, and by means of a great number of separate pictures they illuminate the external and the internal life of Apostolic Christianity. Whoever merely estimates these letters as documents of the Imperial period will receive much profit. So far as I can see there is no such wealth of spiritual self-evidence of any other man of the Imperial period.

In all these directions the historical value of the letters

of Paul is particularly high because of the fact which I have often emphasized that they are unliterary texts. Paul never thought when he dictated these letters that they would be published, and as published texts would become part of a Holy Book and of the literature of the world. He could not think of a future in which they would be read and criticized. According to his belief there would be no long future. Therefore there was no need for him to pose for posterity. Rather he expressed the moods and the thoughts which arose from the particular circumstances.

The other relics we possess from the Apostolic period have also their great historical value, because they reflect clearly the early Christian piety in the rich variety of its personalities; almost like a volcano eruption as in the Revelation of John, again, calmed and consolidated in the Catholic Epistles, then shortly seeking expression in technical theological terms, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Let us look back. The historical value of the New Testament as a whole lies in the fact that it gives us a fragmentary, yet trustworthy knowledge of the personalities of Jesus and Paul, and of the essence and nature of Early Christianity. This information is not given in fixed formulas but in thousands of occasional intimations, whch the historian must often cut loose from their connections, which are to him accidental, in the manifold strata of their historical transmission.

The new method of working which considers the New Testament in the clearest light of its period, of its Eastern home, and its social class, has altered the judgments on the historical value of the New Testament in many details, but on the whole confirmed its historical value, because it clamped the Holy Book to its contemporary world. The New Testament does not hover without historical connection above its period, but is bound to it by innumerable ties. It spoke the language of its native Mediter-

ranean world. It grew entwined in the class where Christianity originated. It is the reliable residue of the spiritual movement, which refers back to one center of spiritual force, Jesus Christ.

That which we call in history "reliable" has never, it is true, the character of unconditional finality or of mathematical precision. Every historical result is relative. And consequently there is no lack of whimsical excess of historical imagination, which cannot be controlled by automatic means. In most cases, and especially with the great problems of the spiritual history of mankind, the historian has no absolute final method and can give no conclusive proof. He often works with hypotheses, and with all striving for accuracy and objectivity his work is still tainted with an unavoidable subjective element.

But the partaker in this historical work knows well that in spite of all subjectivity and other human failures, historical knowledge progresses, slowly it is true, but irresistibly towards the truth. Therefore he is not alarmed when the subjectivity of the investigator or the imagination of the dilettante fancy that they can pilfer the ancient riches of mankind from the treasure house of the centuries and substitute miserable tinsel for gold. It seems that Clio, the Muse of history, after the hard day's work of her followers needs the game of the fantastic, which she views with a motherly smile.

More than two hundred years ago the French Jesuit Jean Hardouin defended with all seriousness the thesis that the whole of the ancient literature in the Greek and Latin languages with the exception of the works of Homer, Herodotus, Cicero, the Georgica of Virgil, the satires and epistles of Horace, the work of the elder Pliny, and a few other texts, was the work of monks in the thirteenth century A. D. under the direction of a certain Severus Archontius. It was the same Hardouin who in 1715 published a work of twelve volumes on the Christian Councils from the year 34 to 1714, although he main-

tained that all Councils before the Tridentine were not historical. When asked why he had written their history he said: "That is not known to anybody except God and myself." After the impassionate war of pens which arose over the radical theses of this man, nothing remained except a sarcastic epitaph; Jacob Vernet of Geneva, who had, perhaps, noticed that smile of Clio, wrote it: "in expectatione iudicii hic iacet hominum paradoxotatus...credulitate puer, audacia iuvenis, deliriis senex," "Here lies, waiting the last judgment, the most paradoxical of all men, in his credulity a child, in his audacity a youth, in his delirious mind an old man."

In the year 1841, a scholar named Kirschbaum reviving an old hypothesis seriously maintained the view that the work of the Jew, Philo of Alexandria, was a forgery of Christian men of literature of the second century A. D. Thirty years ago the Aramaic papyri of the fifth century B. C. from Elephantine came to light. It was an epoch making discovery for Jewish history, and the sheets are today among the most valuable treasures of our European museums. In 1909 during the exultations of orientalists and historians a dissonant voice was heard which declared these original sheets to be absolute forgeries.

We need no more examples. Whoever is in touch with historical research knows that historical investigation does not tyrannize a man by compelling him to accept its results.

There will always be some people whose eyes are so made that they cannot observe a thing, without, I may say, observing it to pieces.

It would be wrong if we had no more than mockery and ridicule for these blighted eyes and pilfering hands. I mean that we should allow no place for mockery and ridicule where we, in bad mistakes, find honest striving for historical knowledge. We should leave history itself to announce the judgment. When the time has come that motherly smile will flash over Clio's pensive face.

It is now more than twenty years since one afternoon in

spring as the sun was sinking I rode on the Ionian coast coming from Miletus toward an ancient Anatolian sanctuary, the ruins of the temple of Apollo at Didyma. On the right was the Aegean Sea with the bare rocks of the distant islands of Samos, Patmos, and Cos. In front Didyma was gradually appearing, a heap of marble and ruins out of which arose the three massive columns of the ancient temple glistening in the evening sun. Long ago a desired object of the archaeological treasure-digger, this temple of Apollo at Didyma, destroyed by earthquakes and the storms of centuries, had to suffer blasting with dynamite, at the hands of men.

But the foundations of the temple withstood the dynamite. They withstood it, because they lay huge and massive, deep in the earth. The earthquakes had been able to destroy the columns; the foundations survived both history and barbarous force.

The foundations of our historical knowledge of Early Christianity taken as a whole seem to me unassailable. Although hidden to those eyes which cannot see into the depths, they lie huge and massive and imperishable in the depth.

THE THEOLOGY OF KARL BARTH: AN ORIENTATION

HENRY OFFERMANN
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Ten years ago the name of Karl Barth was practically unknown to the theological world at large. Today he is undoubtedly one of the most conspicuous figures in the group of Protestant theologians who have come into prominence since the close of the World War. He became famous almost over night by his commentary on Romans, and he has been in the public limelight ever since. When he first attracted attention he was a comparatively young man, and it is perhaps not wrong to say that he was only one of many others who found themselves face to face with what they thought was an intolerable religious and theological situation.

This situation had not been brought about by the war, but the war had opened the eyes of these men and had demonstrated to them the utter hopelessness of the situation. They were trying to discover a path that would lead them out of the wilderness into the land of promise. They were seeking new avenues of approach to the truth and new ways to proclaim that truth to others. Christian civilization had failed. But was this civilization, so they asked themselves, really Christian? Can any civilization be anything but pagan? Is not Christianity the negation of all civilization? The church had failed; it seemed to be a moribund institution; its message was no longer heard and heeded because it lacked that power and authority which will compel people to listen to it. Current theology, whether liberal or orthodox, dogmatic or undogmatic, critical or historical, had failed. The world was crying for bread, and all that theology had to give were stones instead of bread.

Thoughts like these, expressed with all the boldness, impatience and impetuosity of youth and in an exciting, irritable style tingling with nervous life, struck a re-

sponsive chord in many hearts at a time when Oswald Spengler's *Untergang des Abendlandes* was already beginning to loom large on the horizon.

But there was another side to Karl Barth's new message, and it is this other side which has puzzled his interpreters ever since he first proclaimed his message. It is like a sphinx into whose face we stare or whose face is staring at us—an inscrutable face, immobile and yet ever changing, mute and yet so eloquent, protesting, accusing, questioning. One thing seems to be certain: A theology that sounds the death knell of all theology cannot be the last, redeeming word that will show us the way out of darkness and despair into light and freedom. No theology can live by negations, by protest, by raising everlastingly questions without answering them. It must have in it something positive, a constructive element, if it wants to make its appeal to others and convince them. Even in the first stage of Karl Barth's theological development, which is represented by the first edition of his commentary on Romans, this positive, constructive element is lacking.

It is both gratifying and refreshing to see how Barth turns for his own spiritual and theological guidance to the first and greatest of all Christian theologians, and is trying to find in the rediscovered Gospel of Paul the solution of all his problems. And it is not a modernized Paul to whom he turns, not a Paul whose "religion" is accepted but whose "theology," especially in its sterner aspects, is rejected. There is a world of difference between the Paul of Karl Barth and, for example, Deissmann's Paul or the picture of Paul in Peabody's *The Apostle Paul and the Modern World*. It is also a significant fact that of all epistles of Paul Karl Barth should have taken Paul's Epistle to the Romans and made it the basis for the presentation and proclamation of his own message. By choosing this great document to proclaim his new message to the world he followed the example of the Reformers, and he did it consciously, purposely, intentionally. There is a real connection between Karl Barth's message

and the message of the Reformers. In his interpretation of Romans he is more indebted to Calvin's really great commentary than to any of the modern commentators.

Finally, we may note throughout the commentary the author's earnest endeavor to bring his own interpretation of Paul's Gospel into living relation with the spiritual needs of his readers. Not that the commentary is what might be termed devotional or practical in the ordinary sense. But as the author is constantly wrestling with his own thoughts, so he is also wrestling with his readers, arguing, reasoning, pleading, trying to persuade and to convince. The years which Karl Barth spent in the active work of the ministry before he became a professor of theology have left their marks, not only in his commentary but in all his writings. The professional theologian is still the *minister verbi divini*, the preacher of the Word. Whatever may be our final judgment with regard to his theology, we must admit that Karl Barth wants to be biblical, that he wants to serve the church.

Yet, as we read Barth's commentary on Romans, we begin to wonder whether his interpretation gives us a true picture of the real Paul or not. It may be a minor point, but it is characteristic of Barth's exegetical method that grammatical, literary and historical questions are of little importance to him. In some cases, when he touches upon them, he brushes them aside with an impatient gesture. In other cases, when he discusses them, he seems to be prepossessed by a pet theory of his own. However, we are here concerned not so much with the exegetical merits of Barth's commentary as with the theology which it contains. Is this theology the theology of Paul or is it the theology of Karl Barth? The question itself cannot be avoided; it forces itself upon us by what has been called the dialectical method of Barth's whole theology. Does this method with its contradictions, antitheses and antinomies give us the key to the thought-world of the apostle Paul? And what is back of this method? Is it based upon a philosophy of religion which must eventually lead to a dissolution of all objective Christian truth?

The storm of controversy about the theology of Karl Barth set in as soon as his commentary on Romans had made its appearance, and it has not subsided, but, if anything, has become fiercer with each new publication from his facile and prolific pen. There was something revolutionary, but also something immature about his theology in the first edition of his commentary, and no one knew it better than Barth himself. He is an indefatigable worker, and it goes almost without saying that a man of his brilliant gifts will not only add to his store of learning and knowledge as the years roll on, but will also clarify and modify his earlier views.

In this expectation we are not disappointed. In fact, no other theological writer springs so many surprises, both on his critics and his friends, and this may be one of the many reasons why it is so difficult to get at the roots of his theology. The first edition of his commentary was published in 1919. Of the second edition, which appeared three years later, Barth himself could say that in it no stone had been left upon another. With this second edition of his commentary the theology of Barth entered upon the second stage of its development. Numerous other publications followed in rapid succession. Many of them are sermons, articles and lectures on a variety of subjects. A collection of eight addresses has recently appeared in an English translation by Douglas Horton under the title *The Word of God and the Word of Man* (Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1928). It is at the present most favorably commented on in the religious press of the country and will no doubt find a large sale among those who have heard about this strange prophet in the wilderness. But it is only fair to say that these addresses were delivered in the years 1916-1923 and therefore do not represent the latest phase of Barth's theological development. It should also be obvious that a volume of addresses is hardly sufficient as a basis for a well balanced judgment on a theology so complex and elusive in its principles as that of Karl Barth.

Far more important than these occasional addresses,

lectures and articles are the larger publications of Barth. Two of these are of an exegetical nature: *Die Auferstehung der Toten,* a course of academic lectures on the basis of First Corinthians, especially chapter fifteen, and *Erklaerung des Philipperbriefes,* an exposition of Paul's great letter of friendship. The exposition of First Corinthians is in many respects a counterpart of the commentary on Romans; it is written in the same vigorous language, and it leaves the same impression of being under the strong influence of a theological position that dominates the exegesis. The exposition of Philippians, the latest of Barth's exegetical works, is of a somewhat different type. It is less dogmatic, more moderate in its judgments and conclusions and shows a finer apprehension of the real Paul, based upon a careful study of the text. But those who have read Barth's commentary on Romans, his exposition of First Corinthians, as well as his numerous other publications, cannot fail to notice in his interpretation of certain passages of Philippians the *vestigia leonis* of the genuine Barth.

The most important of all his writings, however, surpassing even his commentary on Romans, is Barth's *Die christliche Dogmatik im Entwurf* of which the first volume of nearly 500 pages appeared in 1927. It was perhaps inevitable that Barth should eventually turn from the field of Exegetical and Practical Theology to the department of Dogmatics which enables him to set forth the fundamental principles of his theology in a more systematic form. At any rate, Barth himself has felt this need: it is the only way, he declares in the preface (page V), to continue in a dignified and profitable manner the discussion, which has been called forth by his own writings and those of his friends. We can only agree with him and are sincerely grateful to him for his decision which has resulted in the monumental work that lies before us. With this systematic presentation of his theology before us we should now be in a better position to form our judgment, to get at the heart of his theology and to correct wrong impressions and misunderstandings

which his former writings may have produced. The fact that the work itself is incomplete may be a cause for regret, but it is not as important as one might think. For although this first volume contains only the Prolegomena or the introduction to his *Dogmatik*, it is Barth's contention that the introduction to Dogmatics is Dogmatics itself, that the Pro-legomena should really be Legomena (pp. 11-17). It would perhaps be better to have no Prolegomena at all. But if there are to be such Prolegomena, they can only consist in the discussion of certain selected *Loci* which have their proper place in the field of Dogmatics itself.

In accordance with this conception of the dogmatic task Barth discusses in this first volume of his *Dogmatik* the doctrine of the Word of God. The reason for the selection of this particular doctrine is not given at the outset, but it becomes clearer as Barth gradually develops his doctrine of the Word of God. The term "the Word of God" is really an all-inclusive term; it must be taken in the most comprehensive and widest possible sense. To unfold and explain the true meaning of the Word of God is the supreme and, rightly understood, the sole task of the Christian theologian; and not only of the Christian theologian, but also of the Christian minister who as such is called to preach the Word of God and nothing but the Word of God. This Word of God comes to us in a threefold form: in the first place, as the message of the church; in the second place, as the canon of the Bible; in the third place, as the revelation of God. It comes to us through human agencies with all their imperfections, and it is heard by human ears and in human hearts with all their fallibilities and delusions. It is never present anywhere in its pure form, and yet it is a reality; it is the answer of God to the question of man; it is the word from home, addressed to the *homo viator*, which tells him that he may come home (p. 75).

The phenomenon of the Christian message or the church's preaching is the starting point of the dogmatic task. But the Christian message or the church's preach-

ing is the word of God because it is founded in the Scriptures. And the Scriptures are the word of God because they are founded in God's revelation. God's revelation needs no other foundation; it is the speaking God himself, and his speaking cannot be distinguished from his person. The word of God is therefore identical with the revelation of God, and the revelation of God is identical with God himself; it is the *Dei loquentis persona.* God himself is subject, object and predicate of his revelation; he is also that which is revealed. Consequently the word of God as God in his revelation is simply the unfolding of the two little words: *Deus dixit.* In these two little words we have also the roots of the doctrine of the Trinity: God reveals, God *reveals,* God reveals *himself,* and in all three modes (*Weisen*) he reveals himself as the Lord. In other words, the speaking God who reveals himself is always the triune God, the Lord who is the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, *unus Dominus,* one divine Ego, one personality, who wherever he reveals himself always reveals himself as Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The one God who is our Lord is either the triune God or he is nothing at all.

Historically speaking, the doctrine of the Trinity, which is the very foundation of the Christian faith, is the unfolding of the confession that Jesus is the Christ, the *Kyrios,* the *Logos* of God. The historical personality of Jesus of Nazareth, apart from this confession, is an abstraction; the so-called "historical Jesus" is an empty throne without a king (p. 135). The historical Jesus, if it were possible to speak of him, would be nothing but a creature of the triune God, the vessel of the revealer, but not the revealer himself. Indeed, from the historical standpoint it is entirely correct to say with Harnack: "Not the Son, but only the Father belongs in the Gospel as Jesus proclaimed it" (p. 174). But who is the Father in the Gospel of Jesus? He is *his* Father, and because he is *his* Father he is also *our* Father; that is, he is the Creator, and as the Creator he is the *Fons totius Deitatis.* It is wrong to say that Jesus has revealed God the Crea-

tor as God the Father. Precisely opposite is true: Jesus has revealed the Father as the Creator. But as the Father of the Son he is more than the Creator; he is also the Mediator, the God who reconciles, and he is, finally, also the Redeemer as the Spirit who proceeds from the Father and the Son. Creation, reconciliation and redemption are the threefold work of the triune God in his threefold revelation as Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

The doctrine of the Trinity is the theology of revelation. But the reality of the revelation of God, which expresses itself in the statement that God is God, raises at once the question of its possibility or rather its impossibility. If God is God, then he cannot reveal himself unless he becomes man himself. Thus the doctrine of the Trinity leads us to the doctrine of the Incarnation, which has found its classic expression in the words of John: The Word was made flesh (John 1:14). By his incarnation the *Deus absconditus* becomes the *Deus revelatus*, but, *vice versa*, the *Deus revelatus* becomes also the *Deus absconditus*. This is not a construction *a priori*, but a construction *a posteriori*, for the Biblical formula "incarnation of the Word" is a philosophical absurdity, but a theological necessity resulting from the understanding of the direct and concrete word of God addressed to men (p. 228).

The incarnation of the Logos in Jesus Christ is history. Yet it is not history in the sense in which we use this term. For every historical event is ambiguous; it may be a banality, it may be a myth (p. 237). History is not revelation. Revelation may be history. But it is more than history; it is what Barth calls *Urgeschichte*, pre-historical, superhistorical, timeless history; it is the unity of the act of the direct word spoken by God to us with the historical event. Revelation as history and revelation as timeless history stand in the same relation to each other as prophecy and fulfillment. The historical testimony of the Old Testament is prophecy. But the same is true of the New Testament; its testimony is also prophecy, not fulfillment. The fulfillment comes when the incarnation

of the Logos is recognized as reconciliation. For revelation is identical with reconciliation (p. 257).

But how can the revelation of God in the incarnate Logos be received? Or in other words: How can the word of God be heard? The answer is: By the grace of God, and the Grace of God is identical with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (p. 285). This grace of God by which we receive and perceive the word of God is psychologically incomprehensible, just as incomprehensible as the incarnation of the Logos is historically incomprehensible (p. 293). But God has given us a visible sign of his grace, and this sign is the Sacrament of Baptism. Baptism is not a means of grace, but it signifies the reality of the grace of God so that in virtue of my baptism I can trust, not in the grace of God itself, but in this my trust in the grace of God (p. 299). Man's attitude to the grace of God which he receives when he hears the word of God may be described as faith and obedience (p. 325).

In the next chapter Barth then discusses the word of God in the Scripture. The Scripture, the Bible, is a collection of ancient religious literature, and as such it is the object of historical investigation. The historian *canno* see and find in it anything but the words of men (p. 334). If the theologian regards the Scripture as the Word of God, it means that the testimony of the Biblical writers is an echo of that word which God has directly spoken to them. Their testimony as such is not the Word of God (p. 345); it remains their own; it is fallible, and the Christian church must have the courage to let the historical critic say what *he* has to say, in order that *she* may say what *she* has to say, viz., that she has heard in the testimony of the Biblical writers the *viva ipsa Dei vox* (p. 346). The church has expressed this judgment in the formation of the Canon. But the formation of Canon is based upon the *testimonium internum* or the *arcanum Spiritus Sancti.* Through the Spirit the word of God is perceived by the first witnesses, and through the same Spirit their testimony becomes the medium of the word of God for us. The Scripture becomes the word of God when the Spirit is

speaking to us and in us through the Scripture; it is never the word of God *extra usum.* This would be a subjective norm if the Scripture were not primarily given to the church. Yet the authority of the church is only relative while the authority of the Scripture is absolute (p. 362). The individual Christian has the inherent right to exercise his freedom of conscience as over the authority of the church (p. 388).

With the last chapter which deals with the word of God in the church's message or preaching Barth comes back to his starting point. He discusses the problem of the word of God in its relation to the ministry of the Word and to the minister who *must* preach the Word and yet *cannot* preach it because God is always the preacher of his own word. In connection with this problem the question of the purity of doctrine is raised and it is shown how this question can be solved with the help of the service which the work of Dogmatics can render the Christian minister and the Christian church. For the work of Dogmatics and the dogmatician is an auxiliary function of the church; it is far inferior to the ministry of the Word, but it may become its handmaid. In a closing parapraph the argument is made that the formal principle of Dogmatics, which consists in the Word of God, is identical with its material principle. Thus the end returns to the beginning and the circle is closed. *Deus dixit.*

So far the first volume of Barth's *Dogmatik.* It is a great book. It is a fascinating book. But it is also a difficult book, and its chief difficulty lies not only in its style but chiefly in the dialectical method of Barth's theological reasoning. One is never sure of having understood him or misunderstood him. It is not our intention to enter into a dogmatic discussion of his theological position. All we can hope for is to point out the way that may lead to a better understanding of the nature of his theology and of the place which it occupies in the theological situation of the present time.

But how shall we go about our task? It may be very interesting, but it is of very little help to us, to consult

the current literature on Barth. There is such a great divergence of opinions and such a babel of voices that we are rather bewildered and confused. Barth is not the founder of a theological school, although we hear already of Barthians and Barthianism, just as formerly we heard of Ritschlians and Ritschlianism. In fact, when Barth first proclaimed his new message, he meant it to be merely " a corrective", or "a marginal note" to all current theologies. He has now changed his earlier views, and it may be that he will soon be hailed as the founder of a distinct theological school. At any rate, he has gathered around him a group of friends and admirers, among whom Brunner, Thurneysen and Gogarten are the most prominent. But there are many others who sympathize with his views, and among them are some who are conservatives and others who are known as liberals or, like Bultmann, as radical critics. But it would be unfair to judge Barth by his friends. For, after all, Barth is Barth.

When we turn from this group of his friends and sympathizers to the large circle of those who have reviewed his books or have published articles and monographs about him, we meet with the same difficulty. Many praise him, many condemn him, and in both camps we find all sorts of men, orthodox and liberal, modernists and, strange to say, even fundamentalists. A reviewer of his book *The Word of God and the Word of Man* in The Expository Times writes: "No one who reads this book can fail to hear in it the authentic voice of a prophet." Another reviewer of the same book in The Biblical World, published by the Biblical Seminary in New York (formerly the White Bible School) ventures to express the rather naive opinion: "He (Barth) stands squarely on the redemptive principles to which Fundamentalists and Essentialists, alike, are committed." On the other hand, Dr. D. F. Jenkins has published in a recent issue of The Presbyterian a spirited attack on Barth's *Crisis Theology* as being diametrically opposed to historic Calvinism. Of European scholars we will here mention only two of the

many who have expressed an opinion about the theology of Barth. One is Adolf Harnack, for many years the brilliant leader of modern liberal theology in Germany, who characterizes Barth's theology as modern Gnosticism, a revival of the ancient Marcionitic heresy. The other is Albrecht Oepke, a confessional Lutheran and professor of the New Testament in the University of Leipzig, who in a very fine treatise, which is based upon a lecture, tries to show that Barth's theology has its roots in pure mysticism.

It is not necessary to go further with this collection of different opinions. No doubt, they are interesting like a shop of curios, and some are valuable. But, somehow, they do not satisfy us. We would like to understand before we take sides. And a real understanding of Barth, the man and the theologian, is a difficult thing. For Barth is always Barth; he is not one of the herd; he is a lonely man, a wanderer who prefers the jungle to the beaten path, a *vox clamans in deserto.* One difficulty is with his style; it is rhetorical, sometimes almost journalistic. Barth is always preaching, and constant preaching gets on one's nerves; he is the dogmatic preacher or the preaching dogmatician.

Another difficulty lies in Barth's terminology. Barth uses the theological terms of the past; he fairly revels in them. He is as familiar with John of Damascus and Augustine as he is with Anselm of Canterbury and Thomas Aquinas or Petrus Lombardus, as familiar with the Chalcedonense as with the Heidelberg Catechism, as familiar with Luther and Calvin as with Schleiermacher, Troeltsch, Schaeder and other modern theologians, and he is fond, perhaps overly fond, of quoting them all. But he frequently uses the theological terms of the past in a sense different from the sense in which they are generally used and understood. He retains the word, but he changes the meaning. One has always to be on guard so as not to be misled into the belief that his theology is the same as that of the scholastics because of his use of the same ecclesiastical terminology. There is really no reason

for saying that Karl Barth, the modern theologian, has renounced his former position and has gone over with flying colors into the camp of the scholastics.

The greatest obstacle in the way of understanding Barth's theology is the dialectical method of his whole theological thinking and reasoning, the juxtaposition of opposite views which are both affirmed and negatived. It was Bengel who once said: *Contradictoria non sunt in theologia.* Barth's theology is full of contradictions, paradoxes and antitheses, to such an extent and degree that it has been characterized as the Theology of Paradox. It would be unfair to Barth to charge him with logomachy, the love of juggling with words and turning the controversy to a dispute about merely verbal points. On the contrary, Barth is thoroughly convinced that the dialectical method with its contradictions and paradoxes corresponds with the nature of the Christian truth itself. This conception of the Christian truth goes far beyond what the Apostle Paul means when he writes: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God; how unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out; for who hath known the mind of the Lord or who has been his counsellor" (Rom. 11:33 f.). Paul recognizes the mystery of God's truth and revelation. It is "the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory" (I Cor. 2:7). It pertains to "the things which God hath prepared for them that love him," things which "eye hath not seen nor ear heard neither have entered into the heart of man" (I Cor. 2:9). But Paul also says that God has revealed these things unto us by the Spirit; "for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God"; he tells us that we have received the Spirit of God "that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God" (I Cor. 2:12). The mystery which Paul has in mind is the truth that was hidden but is now revealed.

In the theology of Barth revealed truth in the sense of Paul has, strictly speaking, no place. The truth which God reveals, his "word," is the speaking God himself, and

the speaking God who reveals himself is and remains the hidden God, the *Deus absconditus*. All we know about him is that he is The Wholly Other One whose grace is judgment and whose judgment is grace. As the Wholly Other One he is speaking to us, or rather speaking to himself, and this is the all-important thing. It does not matter *what* he is speaking; his "word" is, therefore, in the last analysis an empty shell without a kernel. But the shell may be as important as the kernel itself. At any rate, God and his "word" are one, and if God is the Wholly Other One, his "word" cannot be anything different to him; it is in its very nature the *coincidentia oppositorum*. Barth's idea of God is the key to the gate of his Theology of Dialectic. The dialectical method of his theology is not a mere *lusus ingenii*, as it may seem at the first glance, but the natural and necessary consequence of his abstract idea of God with its one-sided emphasis on the transcendent. God and the world are so far apart that they can never come together. *Finitum non capax infiniti.*

Barth's own theological position will become clearer when we consider it in its relation to current theological thoughts and tendencies by which it has been influenced and to which it is opposed. During the last decades of the nineteenth century modern theology was to a large extent under the dominating influence of Albrecht Ritschl. After the death of Ritschl in 1889 his school divided itself into a left and a right wing. The differences between these two wings are by no means unimportant. But certain characteristic features of Ritschl's theology are common to both of them. With the master the disciples of Ritschl share in the aversion to all metaphysics in theology. And with the elimination of the metaphysical element in the theology of Ritschl goes hand in hand the axiom that all theological judgments are *eo ipso* value-judgments and as such have no place in the sphere of objective truth. The philosophical basis of this theology was the philosophy of Kant or rather an interpretation of the critical principles of Kant which may be described as

Neo-Kantianism. One of the last publications of the late Julius Kaftan in Berlin, a pupil of Ritschl, was a book on the Philosophy of Protestantism, in which the synthesis of Neo-Kantianism and Ritschlianism has found its ablest, and very probably also its last, exponent.

The philosophical principles which underlie the theology of Karl Barth stand in direct opposition to those of Ritschl and the Ritschlian school. Barth would certainly not be willing to let any philosopher or philosophical system prescribe for him the boundaries that would prevent the theologian from penetrating into the realm of metaphysical truth. His break with Ritschl and the Ritschlian school is definite and complete. His whole theology is rooted in metaphysical concepts; it is metaphysical ontology, pure transcendentalism. Barth himself admits the philosophical texture of his theology. It is not Kantianism; it is not Platonism. But Plato and Kant are the two philosophers from whom he has learned and to whom he owes a debt of gratitude. Yet the influence of Plato and Kant upon Barth's theology must not be overestimated. His philosophy has not determined his theology; the truth is rather in the opposite direction: his theology has determined his philosophy.

There are other influences noticeable in Karl Barth's theology. Albrecht Oepke in his monograph *Karl Barth und die Mystik* has made the attempt to trace the last roots of Barth's theological principles to Oriental mysticism. At first thought this may seem to be a hopeless task, for mysticism in the ordinary sense of the word emphasizes the immanence of God, for which there is no room in Barth's transcendentalism. But there are many forms of mysticism, and if transcendental mysticism is one of them, Oepke's thesis is not so far-fetched after all. In the last analysis the question of the relation of Barth's theology to mysticism depends upon the definition of the term "mysticism."

However, there is no need to go back as far as Oepke does in order to understand the fundamental principles of Barth's theology. Barth himself is a modern theologian, and in many respects he is ultra-modern. In his younger

days he was a pupil of Hermann, the warm-hearted exponent of the theology of the inner life. He still cherishes the memory of his revered teacher, but he also confesses that the only way to show his gratitude to him was to acknowledge his inability to accept his master's theological position. Herrmann himself had been a pupil of Ritschl. But his own dogmatic position may be characterized as a pious subjectivism combined with a critical attitude to the Scriptures. Barth's keen intellecutalism discovered the twofold weakness of such a position. Its one weakness is its subjectivism, its other weakness the insecurity of its historic foundation. But inasmuch as these two elements are characteristic of all modern theology since Schleiermacher, Barth has no use for any modern theological system or any modern theologian. He is the keenest and most radical critic of the development of modern Protestant theology in the nineteenth century, just as some twenty years ago Albert Schweitzer in his *Quest of the Historical Jesus* showed the uselessness of much of the work that had been done in the field of modern historical criticism with regard to the life of Christ. Barth is firmly convinced that the subjectivism of modern theology, which can be traced to the influence of Schleiermacher, is not theology at all, but anthropology or phenomenology of the religious consciousness. He is also convinced that no historical facts as such can ever become the foundation of the Christian faith or the Christian message. Barth is bitterly opposed to psychological subjectivism and historical relativism as the two most formidable enemies of the Christian faith, and since these two enemies dominate all modern theology, he stands practically alone with his theology of Dialectics, with the single exception of the Danish thinker Soeren Kierkegaard who may be regarded as his forerunner.

On the other hand, there is a rich Calvinistic heritage in Barth's theology. In fact, so outspoken and pronounced is Barth's Calvinism that one is almost tempted to call him the *Calvinus redivivus* and to designate his theology as a reproduction of old-fashioned, orthodox Calvinism in the language and thoughtforms of our time.

And if Calvinism is not a system of theology, but a form or type of Christianity which expresses itself in life and worship, in the moral and social sphere as well as in the realm of thought, then there can be little doubt that Barth's theology is genuinely Calvinistic. Barth himself is the son of a Reformed theologian. He served for years as minister of a Reformed congregation. He occupied the chair of Reformed theology in the University of Goettingen, and he has at the present time a similar position in the University of Muenster. The confessions of his church are dear to him, and the spirit of piety which permeates all his writings is the spirit of the churches which are influenced by the confessional principles of the Calvinistic system of doctrine. A theology like that of Karl Barth could not have been produced by a man who had been nourished by the milk of Luther's Small Catechism.

Barth's Calvinism can be noted in almost every doctrine which he discusses in the first volume of his *Dogmatik*. It is especially noticeable in his doctrine of God, his doctrine of the person of Christ, his doctrine of the Word and the Sacraments, his conception of the place of the Law in the Christian life, his valuation of the Scriptures in their relation to the Word of God and the Holy Spirit. Everywhere we meet that dualistic conception of the relation of God and the world which has always been the chief characteristic of Calvinistic theology and which is expressed in the formula: *Finitum non capax infiniti.* Applied to the doctrine of God, this formula means that the revealing God still is and remains the hidden God, the Wholly Other One. Applied to the doctrine of the person of Christ, it means that the *Logos* and the historical Jesus of Nazareth are two distinct persons, that there is no real union of the human and divine in the person of Christ.

It would be a mistake, however, to infer from these remarks that Barth's theology is identical with historic Calvinism. That Barth does not accept the doctrine of inspiration of the Scriptures in the sense in which orthodox Protestantism understood and accepted it is so obvious that it needs no further proof. Of far greater importance is Barth's conception of God's revelation in

Christ with its complete disvaluation of the historical facts of his life and work upon which our faith rests. The historical character of God's revelation in Christ is essential to our faith. It is an entirely different question how we become certain of our faith in God's revelation. But Barth substitutes for what we call God's historical revelation in Christ the enigmatic term *Urgeschichte*. That Christ was born of the Virgin Mary may or may not be a historical event, but as a fact of our faith it becomes *Urgeschichte*. That Christ rose from the dead may or may not be a historical fact, but it becomes *Urgeschichte* when we believe in it. This is certainly not historic Calvinism or a return to the dogmatic position of the Reformed theologians of the sixteenth or seventeenth century. It is still Calvinism, but it is intellectual Calvinism which in the interest of its dualistic conception of the relation of God and the world has broken away from its historical foundation in the person and work of our Lord Jesus Christ.

One can sympathize with Barth's position. He has made a desperate effort to get away from psychological subjectivism as well as from historical relativism. But in both directions he has gone too far. And the remedy which he proposes to safeguard the Christian faith against the inroads of religious psychology and historical scepticism is unacceptable; it is a leap into the dark, a retreat from the field of human knowledge and human history into the unexplored regions of metaphysical ontology where no one can follow him.

Nevertheless, the theology of Karl Barth presents several features which are of permanent value. In the first place, it is theocentric, not anthropocentric. It is a protest against the modern evolutionary idea of religion in which there is no place for a divine revelation in the real sense. In the second place, it calls our attention to the rich heritage which is preserved in the theology of the Reformation and the post-Reformation time. Finally, it is a theology that wants to serve the church, is the church's handmaid and endeavors to interpret the church's message to the world.

THE QUEST OF A PERSONAL GOD IN AN AGE OF SCIENCE[1]

W. C. WALTEMYER
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Science has been so amazingly successful in her efforts to control nature that "there has been born into the world an inextinguishable hope that one by one the old enemies of our race—pestilence, poverty, superstition—will be overcome, and that the conditions of existence will be more tolerable."[2]

Perhaps a more profound explanation of the present day popularity of physical science lies in the fact that we naturally think on the sense plane. Though our mental forms are innate, the materials for thought come through the senses, as John Locke, the founder of sensational psychology, has so clearly demonstrated. And science operates on this familiar sense plane.

Today many are confused because of the apparent conflict between science and religion. Reputed scientific discoveries seem to contradict religious beliefs. Cherished notions are declared untenable. Some religionists are charging scientists with an attack upon fundamental verities. Some scientists retort that religionists are but dogmatists with an iron creed that will never open to receive new truth, and to whom the pain of a new idea is intolerable.

Unfortunately, some are being lost to the Christian church who, thinking it necessary to choose between science and religion, choose science. Especially is this true of those youth who have been subjected to an utlra-conservative note from the pulpit and at the same time to an ultra-radical spirit in the class-room or laboratory.

1 This paper, read before the Eastern Conference of the Maryland Synod, is a digest of the author's thesis presented to the faculty of The American University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Washington, D. C., 1929).

2 C. A. Dinsmore, *Religious Certitude in an Age of Science.*

This creates a serious problem for the church. *The Quest of a Personal God in an Age of (Physical) Science* is a timely subject. The discussion will be undertaken under the following heads: I. Why the Quest for a Personal God; II. Where He may Be Found; III. How He is to be Found, and in conclusion, IV. The True Relation of Science and Religion.

WHY THE QUEST FOR A PERSONAL GOD?

There is a psychological, a philosophical, a scientific and a religious need of God.

1. The Psychological Need. We are dependent beings. We experience this dependence. We are incomplete. We crave completeness. But the self cannot complete itself within itself or even in its fellows. The gregarious instinct, one of the most basic in life, is but an expression of this craving. We reach out for help from our fellow-beings but we find that the completed self is not thus realized. No addition of finites ever reaches the Infinite. In that very thoughtful book, *The Instinct of the Herd in Peace and War* by M. Trotter, gregariousness is regarded as one of the most fundamental instincts, explaining much of human progress. Yet in its very last page is the admission that it is not final, that the individual cannot rest in his fellows. This is but a stage in his outward reaching which ceases not until he comes to the Divine. It is upon such a power or being outside ourselves and beyond our fellow creatures that we depend for physical life and for spiritual life. In him and in him alone the self is completed. Schleiermacher was perhaps the first to make this feeling of dependence basic in a system of thought; but centuries earlier it evidenced itself in religious expressions. Four thousand years ago these words were written on a Babylonian tablet: "Trembling one pursued by evil, dash thyself against the bosom of thy God." Some fifteen hundred years later this cry came out of the midst of Judah: "As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God." Paul experienced an ecstasy of soul and cried,

"Christ liveth in me." Augustine exclaimed, "We came forth from thee, O God, and our hearts are restless until they rest in thee."

This dependence demands a God not only metaphysically perfect but more, a God morally perfect. The one upon whom we depend must be free of our moral imperfections and of the moral imperfections of our fellows. He cannot be lower than our ideals, whether they be our personal ideals or the ideals of the community. Whence come these ideals? They are not the emanations of our brains. They are of interest to the "Power not ourselves," for from him ideals come. He is both the Supreme Power and the Supreme Worth.

2. The Philosophical Need. Philosophy has for its aim the systematic interpretation of the universe—a universe that includes man and the cosmos. In his *Introduction to Philosophy* William Jerusalem says, "Philosophy is the intellectual effort, which is undertaken with a view to combining the common experience of life and the results of scientific investigation into a harmonious and consistent world-theory; a world-theory moreover, which is adapted to satisfy the requirements of the understanding and the demands of the heart. Philosophy aims to think things through. The mind in its endeavor to understand the universe seeks unity. Unity is not to be found in anything material. Everything material is capable of infinite divisibility. The term unity can be applied only to that which cannot be divided. The only thing we know that is not divisible is spirit, whether human or divine. Unity, therefore, is found only in the human and divine spirit. But we have already seen that the human spirit is dependent. The only independent spirit is God. He is the only adequate explanation of the universe. Philosophy begins with phenomena but does not rest until reality is reached. The philosophical demand is for a God metaphysically perfect.

3. The Scientific Need. The mind demands a system. The scientist assumes the uniformity of nature, that is, that the laws of nature are the same, hold good, every-

where in the universe. But what are laws of nature? Laws themselves are abstractions; they have no reality in themselves; they have not meaning apart from being They are not entities existing in their own right. The truth is, we impose these laws on nature. As Kant has shown, the understanding makes nature.

The scientist is not interested in so-called dead matter. If it did not move it would have no interest for him. He is interested in movement and that which produces the movement. But he cannot rest in a mere principle such as force, for example. A principle by whatever name you call it, force or energy, has no meaning apart from being. We may use general terms for convenience in thinking. For instance, we may refer to walking, talking, singing, etc., but actually we know no walking, talking or singing apart from the walker, talker or singer. The general is made real only in the particular. The scientist must perforce affirm an ultimate being, or world-ground, as the source of power or energy. Of course, science says nothing as to the character of this being. Science, as such, knows nothing of a personal God.

4. The Religious Need. To us this should be the most obvious. Two statements should suffice. First, regeneration or the new-birth which we believe to be a necessity is impossible without God. Second, God is the necessary dynamic for a high moral life. Kelvin said, "Belief in God is the foundation of all religion." He meant that without such belief there is no motive for heroic living or for self-sacrifices of any kind nor any such thing as the development of the consciences, the ideals and the aspirations of mankind. We who believe in the sufficiency and efficacy of Divine grace must know there is a source of that grace.

Religion needs not only a God, it needs a personal God. It is an essential and universally realized characteristic of human nature for man to worship a Spirit akin to himself. "You may find," says Plutarch, "communities without walls; without letters; without kings; without money; with no need of coinage; without acquaintance with

theaters or gymnasia; but a community without holy rite, without God, that uses not prayer; without sacrifice to win good or to avert evil—no man ever saw or will see."

Religion has always been personal, a matter of personal relationships. It has always assumed God to be personal. Primitive man personalized everything: he might worship the sun, the moon, the stars, the sea or whatnot; but always there was something alive about it, something moving, something like himself. In his *Introduction to the Study of Comparative Religions* Jevons says, "Religion from the beginning has been a search after a power which has been essentially personal."

Prayer is the root of religion. There can be no religion without prayer. And prayer means nothing unless addressed to a person. Sacrifice has for its aim communion with God, a person.

No other than a personal God can satisfy. We are persons, possessing a measure of self-consciousness and self-determination. God can be no less than we. Henry van Dyke has an excellent sermon on "The Meaning of Manhood" in which he shows the dignity and worth of man to be evidenced in three things: his origin, in the image of God; his capacity, for fellowship with God; his destiny, immortality. Such a being can have for his God nothing less than one who is personal.

Samuel McComb in his little book on *God's Meaning in Life* has beautifully expressed in another way the need of a personal God. He says, "The value of friendship lies in the need of that perfect understanding which the soul craves, a sharing of its pleasures and pains, an interchange of thought and encouragement, and of moral strength. But in every human friendship there lies, implicitly, a friendship of another and a higher order. We idealize our friends. We attribute to them qualities which at best they possess only potentially; and when they fail us we weep the bitter tears of an infinite loss. If beyond and above our human friends there is no other, if their goodness and sympathy are the only goodness and sympathy that exist, then indeed we are the vic-

tims of a tragic fate. For love is ever seeking to go beyond the temporal and the visible to mingle with the vastness of the infinite and divine."

There are two classes of men who object to the idea of a personal God, the first, because they are materialists. Happily, they are few. Of practical materialists there is a disheartening abundance, but theoretical materialists are today, in influence and in numbers, almost negligible. As a foremost American scientist says, "Materialism, as commonly understood, is an altogether absurd and an utterly irrational philosophy, and is indeed so regarded by most thoughtful men."[3]

The other group of objectors to the conception of a personal God consists of those who, with generally good motives, hope through such objection to escape a crude anthropomorphism. We admit to anthropomorphic conceptions of God. It could not be otherwise. Our experience colors our thinking. Indeed it furnishes all the materials for thought. It is inconceivable that we should ever crave or realize fellowship with a being different from us in kind. The difference is merely one of degree. We cannot escape a degree of anthropomorphism. On the other hand it is not necessary for us to ascribe the limitations of human personality to God as man has sometimes done.

Browning in his *Caliban Upon Setebos* strikingly presents that common error of man and indicts him for it: "Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such a one as thyself." Caliban is meditating upon his God, Setebos. He pictures the deity thinking and doing exactly as he thinks and does. There is Caliban, the savage, lying in the mud

> "Flat on his belly in the pit's much mire,
> With elbows wide, fists clenched to prop his chin"—

and as he soliloquizes, he sees a line of crabs marching by on their way to the sea. He lets twenty pass, then with a stone smashes the twenty-first. He asks himself why he

3 R. A. Millikan, *Science and Life.*

let twenty go by and killed the next. He has no answer but a shrug of the shoulders. "So is Setebos and so he does," says Caliban. But the significant thing is that even Caliban could not be satisfied with a God of mere caprice. Therefore, he postulates another Power, higher and greater than Setebos, and for want of a better name calls him the Quiet. Not even the thinking savage would have a God with human limitations.

The need of God is evident in the demand of psychology, philosophy, science and religion. The demand is not only for a God, but for a personal God. If he is not personal then he is no God at all.

II

WHERE MAY THIS PERSONAL GOD BE FOUND?

Surely not in calamities such as fires, floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes and volcanic eruptions. Not in war, famine, pestilence or human suffering. God is not the author of suffering or evil in the world. These evils do not come from God as punishment for a definite sin or as chastisement to make good men better. As a matter of fact, natural calamities apart from ignorance and violation of law, moral and physical, are reduced to a minimum. "It is one thing to say God can and does overrule for good pain and suffering in the world; it is another and very different thing to say that God deliberately sends the distress as though in itself it were a good."[4] God is not found here, but in other and different places.

He may be found, in part, in nature. Wordsworth viewed nature, not as created of God, in the conventional sense, but as itself filled with God, of God as conscious of himself at every point of nature's being. Men and nature were but different manifestations of the one soul of all. Shelley, once an atheist and not finding a conscious will in the universe, never more than an agnostic to our way of thinking, yet advances far into the realm of ideal-

4 McComb, *God's Meaning in Life*, p. 68.

ism when he finds that immortal love pervades the whole of nature.

However, there are others who have not found nature so gentle, so spiritual and so friendly. Some have found nature to be "red in tooth and claw." Coleridge said, "The world so far from being a goddess in petticoats is rather the devil in a straight waistcoat."

The truth is perhaps half way between these positions. Nature, if not beneficent, is at least neutral. Ultimately we may compel all the laws of nature to do our bidding, even to the extent of preventing or controlling and using nature's cataclysms. Nature discloses only indefinitely great power and intelligence, nothing moral or spiritual. Of course nature suggests to thoughtful men the constancy of law, and this is significant. Nature reveals God only in part.

God is found, in part, in history. The lesson of succeeding empires is suggestive. Witness the rise and fall of Chaldea and its Nebuchadnezzar, Persia and its Cyrus, Macedonia and its Alexander, Greece and its philosophers, Rome and its Caesars.

What is history? Carlyle said, "There is no history, only biography." And Emerson agreed when he said in substance, "History is the biography of a few great personalities." If God then is to be found in history we must look for him in men. From inspired men we get a partial revelation, a revelation disclosing at least these two things: the almightiness of God and the ethical nature of God.

We find God more completely revealed in the Scriptures. What a marvelous disclosure of his divine purpose, love and power in those sixty-six books, yet one Book; with approximately thirty-six authors, yet with one aim; written through a period of sixteen centuries, yet dealing with one great subject! It is a revelation necessary to the right idea of God, developing through the ages and culminating in Jesus Christ the necessary, perfect revelation. Elsewhere we may get glimpses of him, may find evidences of his power, hints as to his na-

ture; but the diligent seeker after God will find all his efforts unrewarded until he comes with unprejudiced mind and open heart to his Word.

Is it necessary to say more as to where God may be found? Yes, in experience! Finding him in his Word is a prerequisite, but finding him in experience is not only a possibility but a cosummation devoutly to be wished. We believe in a direct experience of God; the logical intellect never satisfies. Luther experienced God. John Wesley experienced God. Writing of his experience one night in a Moravian meeting in London as he listened to the reading of Luther's Preface to the Epistle to the Romans he said, "I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone for salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins." God's Word induced Wesley's experience of God. This experience of God should be the ideal of every man, for as Kant puts it, "True happiness is communion with the Infinite Being." There is a personal God and we know where he may be found.

III

HOW MAY GOD BE FOUND?

The *How* is closely related to the *Where*, yet is deserving of special emphasis. We have already seen that God is found chiefly in his Word and in an experience induced by his Word. The answer to the question "How may God be found?" is, in brief, through religion. This however needs amplifying, showing that the way lies not through natural religion but through revelation in general and through intuition in particular.

Natural religion has always failed. J. R. Seeley's elaborate argument in his *Natural Religion* collapses when he admits the necessity of linking the natural with the supernatural, proving it a failure and showing the demand for a revealed religion.

Through revelation God is to be found. Revelation distinguishes religion from philosophy. Subtract revelation from religion and you have only philosophy left.

Some object to revelation because of its authority. But we cannot escape authority. Balfour in his *Foundations of Belief* shows that we not only find it impossible to escape authority, but the higher the human mind, the more willing is it to submit to authority. In a world of such diversified knowledge we are compelled to accept the findings of investigators. We live by faith. This revelation has been the signal contribution of Judaism and Christianity, pre-eminently the latter.

If the way to God is through revelation in general, it is through intuition in particular. Thus the revelation is individualized, or made real for the individual. Knowledge through intuition is not shadowy or vague. Indeed no knowledge is more certain than that which comes through our intuitions. The German philosopher, Jacobi, declares that intuition gives the greatest certainty. Bergson has developed a philosophy of intuition. In his *Creative Evolution* and *Mind Energy* he shows intuition to be basic, more primary than the intellect. Hugh Black says, "The most sublime truths were first intuitively perceived." Intuition then becomes the subjective authority; revelation, especially Christ, the objective. Through them and through them alone we find God.

To recapitulate: We have seen that though we live in an age dominated by physical science, man is seriously engaged in the quest of a personal God, for God, and a personal God, alone meets the deepest human need. Such a God may be found, partly in nature and in history, completely in his Word and experience. The means of finding him are revelation and intuition.

IV

THE TRUE RELATION BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION

The problem is not new. Augustine about 400 A. D. warned Christians of foolish statements about the world that would make them laughingstocks. The ideas of Copernicus (born in 1473) were branded as "impious and untrue" by popes, emperors and scholars. Even Luther

said they were "in direct contradiction to the Scriptures." Galileo lived from 1564 to 1642. Religious leaders thought his teachings about the earth's motions might tend to undermine the basis of religion.

Today we have a renewed outburst of this feeling. Who are to blame, the religionists or the scientists? Perhaps both are at fault. Unhappily there are some religious leaders with closed minds and intolerant spirit. On the other hand many scientists err. Prof. C. A. Dinsmore of Yale in the McNair Lectures delivered at the University of North Carolina in 1922, and published under the title, *Religious Certitude in an Age of Science* says, "The narrowest, the most opinionated, the most supercilious persons one finds in our seats of learning are the little scientists, who have sunk so deep into their constricted specialty that they cannot see beyond its confines. They burrow so long in their little mole-runs that their eyes grow dim; they lose all sense of the vastness of the universe; they think the cackle of their laboratory is the murmur of the world. They measure all life with the instruments of their trade. They mistake their generalizations for the philosophy of the universe."

Each side in the controversy accuses the other of an improper attitude. Huxley once wrote to Kingsley, "Sit down before a fact as a little child, be prepared to give up every preconceived notion, follow humbly wherever and to whatever abysses nature leads, or you shall learn nothing." This the scientist claims is his method and should be that of the religionist. That method is more difficult to follow in religion, however, for in religion one is dealing with issues more vital that reach down below the intellectual plane into the region of the feelings. Things that make for love or hate, courage or fear, hope or despair, life or death are bound to be accompanied by a degree of preference or prejudice. Yet, after making due allowance for these more vital issues involved, openmindedness should characterize every seeker after truth in the field of religion as well as in that of science.

What are the respective fields of science and religion?

Science is descriptive; seeks to develop a knowledge of the facts, the laws and the processes of nature; seeks to understand how things act, not what they are; deals with phenomena and with forces; does not interpret; offers no ultimate explanation.

Religion is interpretative; seeks to know the source and destiny of things; seeks to develop the consciences, the ideals and the aspirations of men; has to do with values. The fields, therefore, seem to be distinct.

Each has made large contributions to the progress of the world, yet of a different sort. Those of science represent advances chiefly in industry, commerce, sanitation, medicine, education and creature comfort. The great contributions of religion, especially of the Christian religion, have been individual salvation, benevolent attitudes and works, and personal and national ideals.

Each has its limitations. Science has efficacy only in its own sphere as defined above. There are values which cannot be put to the tests of the laboratory. And hypotheses are not facts. Prof. R. A. Millikan of the California Institute of Technology, the foremost physicist of the United States, awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1923 for his work in isolating the electron, and more recently the discoverer of the rays that bear his name, says, "Evolution is but a hypothesis. It has not, perhaps cannot be proven." He holds to it as a working hypothesis because it satisfies more things than any other theory. It is conceivable that it may have to be given up for some new and better hypothesis. There are very definite limitations to science, and the greatest scientists are the very first to acknowledge them.

Has religion any limitations? Religion has a revelation, the Christian religion a complete and perfect revelation in Christ. Of course there can be no limitation to God. There is no such thing as a developing God. The mind cannot entertain the thought of anything less than a perfect God existing at any time. But God's revelation of himself is conditioned by the mental and spiritual capacity of men, and, in part, by the standards of the age.

Therefore, the difference between Old Testament and New Testament ideas and ideals. God's revelation has been progressively given. But was it not completed in Christ? Yes and no! From the Divine side, yes; from the human side, no. With all humility and with no lack of reverence for the past, does not our knowledge and appreciation of Christ surpass that of those who have preceded us? Do we not with all sincerity and entire confidence expect posterity to know him infinitely better than we know him? This is but claiming for ourselves and for all men the promise given in Jesus' own words, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth" (Jn. 16:12-13). The religionist then should be conscious of his limitations, with a mind ever open to further revelation and new truth. As some one has said, "None of us is infallible, not even the youngest."

There is no necessary conflict between science and religion. This is the positive testimony of the foremost scientists of the world including J. Arthur Thompson, editor of that monumental work, *The Outline of Science,* Robert A. Millikan, already referred to, John Theodore Merz of England, and scores of others. Science and religion are incommensurables, that is, they have no common standard of measurement. Therefore they are not antithetical. They deal with different things and for a different purpose. There was published in 1923 a significant statement to this effect signed by fifteen leading scientists of America, an equal number of religious leaders and a large group of men in public life.

The conflict is between some religionists and some scientists. Narrowness, bigotry and literalism are to be found on both sides. There are scientists getting out of their fields. There are timid religionists afraid to make a single concession. They fear to yield in a single detail, lest they must surrender all.

Science and religion are mutually obligated. The former without the latter will inevitably become a curse. The

latter without the former may become unreal, impractical, obsolete.

Religion should gladly accept the help of science. Indeed from it she has already received large contributions. Science with its new conception of matter has destroyed the old materialism, and materialism undefeated means either no God or a duality. Astronomy teaches that the ultimate activity of the universe is Infinite. Biology and the newly developed medical sciences give more realistic meaning to the conception of sin as the violation of the divine will. "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" is a text any physcian could preach on with conviction, a conviction not the result of fanciful speculation but growing out of experience with hundreds of human beings.

What of the future? There is hope of a new fellowship. Two facts give assurance. First, most great scientists have been and are deeply religious, notably Newton, Faraday, Maxwell, Kelvin, Pasteur; Thompson of Scotland and Merz of England, and in America the eminent evolutionists Osborn and Conklin; Merriam, the paleontologist, Millikan, the physicist, Coulter, the botanist, Angell, the psychologist, Pupin, the electro-physicist, and Chamberlin, the geologist. The second reassuring fact is that most religious leaders today are highly intelligent.

Religion and science will join hands. We have an analogy in Paul, the preacher, and Luke, the physcian. What power there was in that fellowship for the transformation of individuals and communities. With similar co-operation, religion and science may bring in the kingdom of God. For that we should pray!

THE WORSHIP OF SAINTS[1]

H. D. HOOVER
GETTYSBURG, PA.

It is not proposed to present here an exposition of old points of controversy with Rome. There is no disposition to engage in contentious discussion *de cultu sanctorum*. I would keep "warship" out of worship. It seems evident that the Roman church has corrected the abuses formerly connected with official intercession of saints, and it is questionable whether this practice has as large a place in the personal religion of her adherents.

The universal confessional agreement of the Protestant world on the postion taken by the Reformers at Augsburg on this tenet of faith removes this question from the field of practical polemics. The absence of any disloyalty and necessity of defense lifts it out of apologetics. There are other fields which future students may profitably enter: 1) the historic development of saint worship; 2) the field of comparative religion, ancestor worship and saint worship; 3) the contribution of saints toward producing the Reformation: a sociological study; and 4) the engagement of saints in glory and their relation to believers or saints on earth: a speculative adventure in the realm of the philosophy of religion.

Doctor J. C. Kohler's lecture on this article delivered June 10, 1886, is like a beautiful stately, symmetrical spruce tree, towering upward toward the light of eternal truth. It is a complete presentation from the standpoint of systematic theology.

Doctor J. L. Neve's lecture on the Holman Foundation, May 4, 1909, suggests the graceful spreading elm tree, aware of the light above, but unwilling to leave far behind the solid green turf of the historical. In his lecture he gives a suggestive outline of the major roots of the origins.

1 The Holman Lecture on Article XXI of the Augsburg Confession, Gettysburg Seminary, May 7, 1929.

This present study is more or less related to the field of practical theology and religion. It is not intended to be a finished product, ending its existence as pages this to that in Number Three of Volume Two of The Lutheran Church Quarterly. It aims to present humble reflections upon the subject in order to awaken further thought and study, and to stir the spiritual creativity of others. We here offer seed. Please accept it with the hulls clinging to the kernels. The hulls should not receive your chief attention. They will fall away and rot if you will plant the seed—the truth herein contained—in good soil and grow saintly character and conduct.

We approach this subject with great sympathy. There are many friends among the celestial saints, high and lowly. Some of these are loved ones, near and dear. It is an impressive thought that many of the lecturers on this Holman Foundation are now saints in glory. The thought that the saints are praying to Him that sitteth on the throne is inspiring. The thought of saints very frequently enters into our worship.

> To Thy temple I repair,
> Lord, I love to worship there,
> When, within the veil, I meet
> Christ before the mercy-seat.
>
> While the prayers of saints ascend
> God of love, to mine attend:
> Hear me, for Thy Spirit pleads;
> Hear, for Jesus intercedes.[2]

The whole subject should be viewed with a heart of charity toward those who did and those who do invoke saints; with a heart of appreciation for those who defended the truth against a long established tradition, so comforting and humane; with a heart of sympathetic interpretation of the truth involved. *Pectus facit theologicum.*

The scope of the word *saints* will be as inclusive as its use in the New Testament. The term saints will designate all who have been received into the church, with

2 *Common Service Book and Hymnal*, p. 448.

especial emphasis upon those who, in character and conduct, best exemplified Christianity.

THE TEACHING OF CHRISTENDOM

What is the creedal position of Christendom on this subject? The Augsburg Confession, Article XXI, reads:

> Touching the Worship of Saints, they teach, that the memory of saints may be set before us, that we may follow their faith and good works according to our calling; as the Emperor may follow David's example in making war to drive away the Turks from his country: for each of them is a king. But the scripture teacheth not to invocate saints, or to ask help of saints, because it propoundeth unto us one Christ the Mediator, Propitiator, High Priest, and Intercessor. This Christ is to be invocated, and he hath promised that he will hear our prayers and liketh this worship especially, to wit, that he be invocated in all afflictions. "If any man sin, we have an advocate with God, Jesus Christ the righteous" I John 2:1.[3]

Article XXI in the Westminster Confession and Article XXII of the Thirty-Nine Articles teach the same doctrine. The Council of Trent (1545-63) in a portion of its findings *de invocatione, veneratione et reliquiis sanctorum* is in harmony with the Lutheran confession when it declares that the faithful "may order their own lives and manners in imitation of the saints; and may be excited to love and adore God, and to cultivate piety."

The teaching of Rome is contained in the canons of the Council of Trent (1545-63). The creed of the council requires that "they especially instruct the faithful diligently concerning intercession and invocation of saints... teaching them that the saints who reign together with Christ offer up their own prayers to God for men; that it is good and useful to invoke them as suppliants; and for the sake of the obtaining of benefits from God through Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour, to have recourse to their prayers."

Romanists explain by a gradation of worship what to Protestants seems to be an inconsistency in their position. They recognize three kinds of worship: 1) *latria,* belong-

3 Jacobs, H. E., *Book of Concord,* Vol. I, pp. 46 ff.

ing to God only; 2) *dulia,* belonging to glorified saints in general; 3) *hyperdulia,* belonging to the human nature of Christ, and the Virgin Mary. They say that saints are to be invoked not to grant our prayers but to aid our intercession; that saints pray for us through Christ and Christ prays to the Father.

The position of the Eastern Orthodox church is given in the Larger Catechism (on the ninth article of creed). Here (Question 13) is set forth an attempt to find a scriptural basis for the mediatory prayers of saints in heaven in Revelation 8:3, 4.

> The Evangelist John in Revelation, saw in heaven an angel, to whom was given much incense, that he should offer it, by the prayers of all saints, upon the golden altar which was before the throne; and the smoke of the incense ascended up by the prayers of the saints out of the hands of the angel before God.

Elsewhere this catechism teaches further:

> The faithful who belong to the church militant upon earth, in offering their prayers to God, call at the same time to their aid the saints who belong to the church in heaven; and these, standing on the highest steps of approach to God, by their prayers and intercessions purify, strengthen, and offer before God the prayers of the faithful living upon earth (Art. 9, Question 11).

THE STUDY OF THE CONFESSIONS

It is possible to experience a thrill and awaken great enthusiasm by a study of the forms and statements of that formative sixteenth century. Topical studies of the Confession as a whole would yield rich returns: example—The Augustana and Internationalism. The painstaking efforts of the past have not always succeeded in rescuing the "Battle flag of the Reformation" from a closed cabinet in the museum of ecclesiastical history. Its truthful colors, even though they be restated, should be a rallying point in the van of present day progressive forces. They lose much of their meaning when they are not.

A method of study could be found which would make it a vital contributor to contemporary church leadership. Its four hundred years of fruitful history is an impressive demonstration. The gigantic problems of this age de-

mand an heroic faith, a prophetic creativeness, and a spiritual fertility as effective as were those of the Reformation era.

Let there be a careful historical study, not only of its challenging contents, but of the causes and conditions and saints which brought it into being, and especially of the creative spirit it exemplifies. This study should then become the means of further study, adaptation and application of the truth in its purity, furnishing inspiration and guidance to a similar heroic exemplification of the teachings and spirit of Jesus among the communion of saints in contemporary society.

The Truth as it is in Christ is life. It cannot be mechanically blocked into the time-bound and materially shaped spaces of any age. Much less can the fittings of its specific application in particular situations be formally preserved and artificially set into the changed openings of other and distant periods and places. Confessions may be treated as lifeless forms or the expression of deathless faith.

Timeless as may be some forms, their timelessness is due not to their form but to what they contain. If Luther were living today, he could not be Luther, the leader of the day, by being a replica of a reformer in the sixteenth century; he would have to be God's prophet and the people's servant in the twentieth century.

The proper use of the truth in historic creeds of the church is its sowing as seed in the soil of humanity, not its storing as harvest in ecclesiastical granaries. At the same time the sprout of the seed of the cherry tree is only modified by time, place and circumstance. No matter where it is planted, that which grows from it: tree, bark, branch, leaf, flower, and fruit are very much the same as the parent tree; they are cherry trees and not oaks. It may be in order here to note the persistent survival of the spirit perpetuated by historic terms.

The rejection of the revised Prayer Book by the House of Commons, even against a popular Prime Minister, is an expression of the presence of a profound instinct of

religious freedom and recalls the remark made by Lord Haldane a score of years ago: "The House of Commons is the most Protestant institution in the country."

The constant reappearance of apparently imperishable phenomena is impressive. Taking an example from another field: just one hundred years ago last April 15, Goethe observed: "What leads young people astray is this, that they are living in a time when so much culture is diffused that it has, as it were, communicated itself to the atmosphere which a young man breathes. Poetical and philosophical thoughts live and move within him; he has sucked them in with his very breath, but he thinks they are his own property, and so he utters them as such." Dr. James Moffatt commenting on this statement recently wrote: "A hundred years have not withered the truth of that judgment." Four hundred years have not withered the truth of the Augustana.

The decisions and procedure of the fathers in politics, jurisprudence, administration and ecclesiasticism are almost a fetish to some today. How well it reflects the spirit that led men of old to make use of the merits of martyrs and the saints in glory.

It is remarkable how near the Romanists and the Reformers came to an agreement at Augsburg so far as the confessional statement was concerned. The Confession was presented in the most conciliatory terms, and as from within the church. One Romanist's first reaction to its reading was that it was the "unadulterated truth." On only six articles (three in entirety) did the Romanists express disapproval and disagreement.

How near together they were on paper according to their formal profession! Yet what tremendous distances between them in spirit! Under the greater part of the confession as a formal statement one could be either a Romanist or a Protestant. But as a whole and in its spirit and in the vitality of its truth it could produce nothing but a Protestant.

How necessary then that we look not upon our Confessions as merely lifeless forms, not as pressed flowers from

the fertile garden of a great period in church history. We should seek to understand the historic occasions and forces which brought them forth, the towering personalities that had a part in creating them, the thrilling conflict from which they issued, the vital truth they contain and the spiritual creativity of that truth. We must and will go farther if we have reached this point—we will then champion the cause of truth, seek to experience God, and "lay down our lives for the brethren" in sacrifical service, in the same love in which Jesus went to the cross, and in imitation and emulation of the holiest saints who have gone on before. So we may fulfill the truth of Article XXI which declares:

> Our confession approves honors to saints. For here a threefold honor is approved. The first is thanksgiving.... The second service is the strengthening of our faith.... The third honor is the imitation first of faith, then of the other virtues, which every one should imitate according to his calling (See *Apology*).

THE PROTESTANT THEOLOGIANS: AN INTERPRETATION

A study of the effect of an inquiry *de cultu sanctorum* upon the Reformers is necessary to understand them. Quoting an English art critic:

> The student must be as thoroughly in touch with the subject treated as were the artists themselves; he must view their work from within, not from without, and if he cannot altogether share their faith in the reality of their visions, he must at least be able with the aid of his imagination to appreciate their attitude.

This is also the case in an attempt to understand the Augsburg Confession.

Furthermore if we study the implications of the use of saint worship in history—in the religious consciousness and life of early Christians—it may help us to an awareness of misleading and imperfect tendencies in Christianity as it is lived today.

The authors of the Augsburg Confession were reared in homes where the saints were worshipped. Their most dearly loved friends invoked the help of saints. The practice became habitual in their lives from childhood up, and proved to be the source of comfort and assurance. It

linked them to the finest characters in history. It bound them to the unseen realm, so much in the religious thinking of their day.

The Reformers faced a practice that was deeply rooted in the religious life of the common people. Luther, in a letter to Spalatin, December 20, 1517, says: "I would not take the legend away contentiously on account of the people, but rather let it cool down and cease, especially since an error like that, born of piety, is not to be so severely condemned as that which leads men to worship saints for money." They faced the danger of robbing some simple folk of all the religion they had. The question, Are the common folk ready for this step of abolishing intercession of saints? presented a real problem.

It is true that the burdensome fees in connection with saint worship made it unpopular. But the fact that it continued in the face of these heavy burdens, and the further fact that the church could impose such heavy taxation upon it without destroying it, is cogent testimony to the great hold this form of worship had upon the imagination, the affections and the life of the people.

The Protestant theologians had at their disposal the testimony of the early church leaders. Consider the effect of such witnesses as Justin Martyr: "It becomes Christians to worship God only."[4] Or hear Tertullian: "For the safety of the Emperor we invoke God, the eternal, true, and living God.... Nor can I pray to any other than to Him, from whom I am sure that I may obtain, because He alone can give it."[5] Origin speaks: "To worship any one else besides the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, is the sin of impiety."[6] The Council of Laodicea (held between 314 and 372 unequivocably declares:

> Christians must not forsake the church of God, and go away and invoke angels and gather assemblies; which things are forbidden. If, therefore, any one shall be found engaged in this covert idolatry, let him be anathema; for he has forsaken our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and has become a proselyte to idolatry.[7]

4 *Apol.* I, p. 63.
5 *Apol.* C. 30.
6 *Comment. in Epist. ad Romanos,* Lib. I, N. 16.
7 *Canons of Laodicea,* XXXV.

Epiphanius is quoted by Bishop Edward Browne as follows: "No doubt the body of Mary was holy; but she was not a God." "The Virgin was a virgin, and to be honoured; yet not given us to be worshipped, but herself worshipper of Him who was born of her after the flesh and who came down from heaven and from the bosom of the Father." "Let Mary be honored, but let the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit be worshipped. Let no man worship Mary."

St. Chrysostom protested against the worship of angels. Augustine declared that Christians honored the memories of martyrs and excited each other to imitate their good deeds, but that they never offered to martyrs the sacrifice of worship.

Jerome also affrmed: "Not only do we not worship and adore the relics of martyrs, but neither sun nor moon, nor angels, nor archangels, cherubim nor seraphim, nor any name that is named, in this world or in the world to come, lest we should serve the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever." At the same time Jerome believed that miracles were wrought at the tomb of martyrs, in the sanctity of relics, and that departed saints prayed for the living. The council of Frankfort (A. D. 794) forbade the invocation of saints.

St. Augustine's testimony for the church in Africa is: "We do not erect temples to our martyrs, as if they were gods; but memories as to dead men whose spirits live with God; nor do we erect altars, upon which we sacrifice to martyrs; but to one God only do we offer, to the God of martyrs, and our God; at which sacrifice they are named at their place and order, as men of God, who, in confessing Him have overcome the world; but they are not invocated by the priest that sacrifices." And he expressly and positively commands: "Let not the worship of dead men be any part of our religion; they ought so to be honored that we may imitate them, but not worshipped."[8]

The Protestant theologians would also evaluate the

8 Augustine, *de civ. dei*, 1.22. c. 10; 1.8. c. 27; *de vera. rel.*, c.55.

record that the Vigilants, the Waldensians, the Picards and other similar groups did not invoke the saints.

All this testimony faced Luther, Melanchthon and the others, all accustomed to call on saints in prayer. By it their thinking was brought into conflict with their religious emotions. We must recall also the fact that the saints of the church had exerted a great influence upon them—even in making them reformers. The flagrant abuses of the practice aroused their indignation. These are some of the forces on one side of the battlefield. There was another side.

It is in order to face sympathetically the view that the lives and works of the saints performed no insignificant part in bringing on the Reformation. The least that can be said is that all those prereformation Christians, be they called sinners or saints, who had much of Christ in them contributed effectively to the revitalization of the church in that critical period. The inspiration which their faith furnished to the Reformers cannot be overlooked.

SOME OUTSTANDING SAINTS

Is it not possible to trace in the characteristics of Luther the influence of outstanding church leaders? A short list of them will prove suggestive:

St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430), the Carthaginian sinner and bishop; conqueror of doubt; one of the world's greatest autobiographers, whose Confessions is one of the priceless heirlooms of the church.

Gregory the Great (540-604), the great servant and apostle of the simple life, under whom sacred music was systematized.

St. Jerome (d.420), founder of Monachism; maker of the Vulgate; educated and cultured, the traveler and spiritual adventurer.

St. Ambrose (d.397), pastor alike to Catholics and Arians; leader and adviser in civics, who outlawed war—at least that of Theodosius.

St. Martin of Tours (317-400), soldier-saint; fiery

preacher, brought from the seclusion of the cell and placed in the busy pastoral service of a bishopric.

St. Francis of Assisi (1182-1226), married to "Lady Poverty"; a sociological force as stimulator of mendicant orders, which revolutionized society; founder of the order of *Frati Minori* (Little Brethren); the unforgettable saint of the ages.

Barnard of Clara Vallis (Vale of Light) or Clairvaux (1090-1153), who aroused France and Germany for the fatal crusade; crushed the hopes and broke the heart of the poet Abelard; a leader of thought; in the judgment of Luther, "a God-fearing and holy monk"; the mystic, hymn-writer, and prophetic preacher.

St. Dominic (1170-1221), man of culture with a lively appreciation of the beauty of art and nature; organizer of the order of Preaching Friars, which produced Thomas Aquinas and great teachers, a great missionary movement, a religious education system for the common people and very beautiful ecclesiastical art.

St. Anthony of Padua (1195-1231), a great preacher of truth; a denouncer of error and oppression; a campaigner against luxury and vice; whose distinguishing characteristics were a simple faith, a deep insight into spiritual things, an intellectual acumen and grasp of great truths.

These, among many, were the examples of Luther and his coworkers their heroes, their spiritual fathers, their cloud of witnesses. Most of them piously and sincerely invoked the saints. The student will stand thoughtfully before that complex background that became a great battleground. When all the forces that played upon their minds are carefully evaluated, the remarkable product of their pen becomes more intelligible.

Consider the position of their opponents. This article against the invocation of saints was presented courteously, cautiously, with sagacity, and in a conciliatory manner. It was backed by the testimony of many church fathers and councils. It was directed against a custom that had been degraded and made unpopular by grave abuses. It was issued at a time of political instability

and social unrest. The Romanist delegates at Augsburg faced a most difficult proposition.

SAINT WORSHIP IN THE CHURCH OF THE DAY

It is necessary to omit here a consideration of the church's great equipment for saint worship, and a study of the relation of the hierarchy of the church to this practice, and also the influence of ecclesiastical caste and ambition. These were potent forces. There are those who believe that Luther would have remained a reformer within the church if the ambitions of John Eck had not brought on a critical situation which occasioned his defiance of the hierarchy of Rome.

The Reformers faced the people. What they did see? How did they come to deny this doctrine? How did they defend the truth in a delicate situation?

It may help to clarify the Roman church's attitude on the canonization of saints and the development of the practice of invocation of saints, if we look about us and within. There is the passionate plea mounting at times to the desperate demand of a soul in distress expressed in the oft repeated request: "Brethren, pray for us." With this is so frequently combined a stubborn but parasitic faith in the promise that "the prayer of the righteous man availeth much."

The laity of the sixteenth century were for the most part passive, receptive, submissive to, and moulded by a powerful ecclesiastical hierarchy. The defenders of invocation of the saints could not well deny the meagerness of biblical authority for it (though they claimed biblical approval), but stressed the fact that this doctrine was created by the authority of the church. And one must not undervalue the creativeness of religion.

Troeltsch in his relativism "makes religion too exclusively a creature of history, whereas religion in its highest—its prophetic—rôle is the creator of history." But if saint worship is a product of religion, then it was a poor religion, whose objective in worship ended its reach this side—far this side—of Jesus, the highest revelation of God we know.

An incorrect view of prayer may enter into the development of invoking saints. For example, if prayer is looked upon chiefly as a means of persuading an unwilling and far distant Providence, there may be good reasons, in the judgment of those holding such views, to consider the merits of saints living in the approval and presence of that Providence as valuable assets, and their help as indispensable.

The incorrect use of prayer may contribute its mite to the growth of this religious practice. For example, if prayer is considered as a means of securing divine approval of and permission for personal preferences and prejudices, or a way of changing the inherent law or nature of things—the will of the Creator himself—to suit the impulse of the solicitor, then truly it may be thought not only advisable but necessary to unite all possible forces, including especially the influence of martyrs, angels, saints and all those near to the Divine, as Mary, to assault as it were the throne of grace with persuasive power.

THE INFLUENCE OF ART

Quite aside from the veneration of saints as a theological tenet is the study of the saints in art. Art was the language people easily understood. Art held the saints before the worshipper from the cradle to the grave. Many, who understood no other language, were at the mercy of the assault of art. "Early Christian art was, indeed, until some time after the conversion of Constantine, practiced solely for the sake of doing honor to the dead and nearly all the examples of it which have been preserved to the present day are the frescoes and sculptures of the catacombs and of some few sarcophagi from elsewhere." The lives and legends of the saints have inspired an overwhelming number of works of art. Subsequently, and to the golden age of painting and sculpture, "there was practically no limit to the production of beautiful work, combining with greater or less technical skill, the expression of the deep reverence for their themes,

characteristic of those who worked, not for earthly gain, but for pure love of art and religion."[9] Religious loyalties and ecstasies expressed themselves in art. And artistic expression in turn inspired certain types of religious faith and practice.

There are definite reasons for this development. The lives and legends were familiar to all, including the simple and untutored. The embodiment of religious truth in personality is both intelligible and inspiring. The expression of these facts and truths in art was essentially the universal language of the people. When this ceased to be the case and when the people learned to express their religion in other languages, the power of the saints symbolized in art to determine the religion of the people waned. In many cases even the memory of the symbol was lost. Interest in saints from the standpoint of creative art was quiescent until the revival of the nineteenth century.

The study of the lives and works of the saints in art has required the best skill and tireless toil of able ecclesiastics and scholars through many years. Their task involved the establishment of the facts; the disentangling of the legendary from the true; the evaluation of testimony; the restoration of filched glory to the proper owner; the relation of secular to ecclesiastical history; patronage of the saints; the influence of saint worship on the religious life of a people; degrees of sainthood and the canonization of saints; symbolism and art. And these studies of art reveal the fact that there is a relationship between the "stage of art development and the religious life of the various periods at which they were produced" (Bell, *l. c.*).

The creation of art, growing out of the veneration of saints,[10] and the alternative contribution of art to the growth of saint worship have had a very real part in the

9 Bell, N., *The Saints in Christian Art*, Preface, Vol. II.

10 "During the fourth century many hundreds of martyrs were sacrificed to the blind fury of the heathen, with the result that more canonized saints belong to it than to any other period." Comparatively few saints are canonized in those periods where the church itself inflicted the death penalty as a punishment for heresy.

religious development of some cults, and a place of considerable consequence in certain if not all stages of the development of the Christian church.

AN INADEQUATE CONCEPTION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

May it not be true, also, that the drift toward intercession of saints was unopposed by an intelligent grasp of Christian truth? What place had the Holy Spirit in the religious thinking of the era of greatest zeal in saint worship? Even today it is difficult to secure for the Holy Spirit his rightful place in the faith and practice of Christians. Minimizing the work of the Holy Spirit, or passing lightly over his relationship to the "child of God," would tend, no doubt, toward an effort to supply a need of intercession. When the Holy Spirit dropped out of their religious consciousness, their felt need of intercession created intercessors out of revered persons such as martyrs, and other saints. They explored the whole region of heaven for intercessors, using creatures celestial and those transferred from the terrestrial. But the Holy Spirit is not listed among them.

Apparently the church shelved the Scriptures in which is taught this doctrine:

> Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God (Rom. 8:26-27).

The only portion of this scripture not scrapped by those who invocated the saints is "we know not what we should pray for as we ought," and this was perverted in practice to read: we cannot pray as we ought; therefore we will get good makers of prayer to petition God on our behalf. Often has the church suffered because it has failed to give the Holy Spirit his proper place in teaching and life.

Incorrect views of scripture and the nature of grace lead the soul, hungry for salvation, to invocate creatures

achieving holiness. The Bible may be used as a compilation of ready-made proof texts, a sort of spiritual patent medicine, instead of the Book of Life. That virtuous merit and holiness could be stored and transferred, was once a current belief. If both of these tenets are kept in mind, and, in the light of them, Hebrews XII is read, we may see how easily false fires may be kindled. Read especially:

> Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.... For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched...ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant (Heb. 12:14-23).

Attention is called to the fact that in the use of this scripture it is shown that the colored mind could find many passages of the Bible that might be interpreted as favoring intercession of saints. Adherents use many passages to defend their position. But all of them require an especial exegesis.

The childhood of the Reformers was spent in and dominated by the Roman religion. Dr. Sabatier divides all religious systems into two great families. "There are religions which look toward Divinity and religions which look toward man.... In the former all effort is concentrated on worship, and especially on sacrifice.... Most pagan religions belong to this category and pharisaic Judaism as well. This is also the tendency of certain Catholics of the old school for whom the great thing is to appease God or to buy the protection of the Virgin and the saints by means of prayers, candles and masses." In the latter he places the religions in which "God is conceived of as a father ready to welcome him who comes to him."[11] The very statement just given connects the practice with the theory. The theory of the religion held by

11 Sabatier, Paul, *The Life of St. Francis of Assisi*, Introd., pp. 21-22.

Rome necessarily produced worshippers who would invoke the help of saints.

Space forbids the mention here of many church practices conducive to submission to her teachings. The economic, social, political and educational conditions of the period helped to emphasize the importance of the church. Sometimes these conditions drove the people to the church, making them helpless to disagree with her commands or practices.

THE WORSHIPPER OF SAINTS: AN INTERPRETATION

And what took place in the souls of these church folk? What was their attitude? In the early days it was easy for people converted from a cult that worshipped and deified mortals to lapse into the worship of martyrs. But press the inquiry into hearts and minds trained under Christian influences.

Did Christians drop down to the worship of creatures, to Mariolatry and covert idolatry because they became strangers to Jesus, their knowledge of him having become lifeless and formal.

Did saint worship just naturally arise because the spiritual creativity of the apostles and early followers of Christ dropped in their successors to a lower level where selfishness devitalized faith and vitiated the fruits of religion?

Why did they trust in the merits of saints' mediation? Did they fancy them more merciful, or was it in recognition of their great faith and noble living? Did they think Christ was too holy to approach? Did teachers stress too strongly the tie of humanity that binds believers to saints?

Luther in his early ministry emphasized this tie of humanity when he said: "Would not angels, yes all creatures, lend willing assistance when the Lord himself stands ready to help? Remarkably, Stephen saw not an angel, not God himself, but the man Christ, he who most delights humanity and who affords man the strongest comfort. Man especially when in distress, welcomes the

sight of another man in preference to that of angels or other creatures."

Love and admiration are somewhere near the foundation of saint worship. It may be that it is a form of ancestor worship, a veneration of fathers and mothers in the faith, and so a survival of paganism.

> He prayeth well who loveth well.
> Both man, and bird, and beast.
>
> He prayeth best who loveth best
> All things both great and small
> For the dear Lord who loveth us,
> He made and loveth all.[12]

Thus based on the belief in the communion of saints unbroken by death, love expressed itself by recognizing the exalted position of beloved ones, now saints around the throne of God, by appealing to their mediatory aid in their endeavor to approach the Majestic king upon the Great White Throne.

No doubt that in some cases prayer based upon intercession of saints was earnest and trustful. Luther in his early ministry in a sermon of the fourth Sunday in Advent said: "In 'supplication' we strengthen prayer and make it effective by a certain form of persuasion, for instance, we may entreat one to grant a request for the sake of a father, or something dearly loved or highly prized. We entreat God by his only Son, his saints, his promises, his name. Thus Solomon says (Ps. 132:1) 'Jehovah, remember for David all his afflictions'."

It is also true that the misplacement of faith and miscarriage of devotion, due in some cases to religious ignorance, manifested themselves in saint worship. Confusion of issues is illustrated by Saint Clara of Assisi who "knelt in a feverish ecstasy of devotion at the feet of Saint Francis, as he cut off her beautiful hair with his own hands." "Do with me as thou wilt," she is said to have cried to him, "I am thine. My will is consecrated to God, it is no longer my own." She thus combined the priest and God in a worship which was due God alone.

12 Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner.*

Do people worship saints because of a desire to achieve a like holiness, or because of a kinship which grows out of their mutual imperfections? Is it due to an inarticulate hope that the worshipper can become quite satisfactorily saintly without disturbing or conquering his faults and bosom sins? Is Elijah attractive because he went up on high in a chariot of fire though he "was a man of like passions with us?" Or is he desired because his victorious struggling soul climbed the way of dry Cherith and because of the poor boarding house of the widow in Zarephath, the juniper tree, and the luminous cave in Horeb? Do saints lift or level admiring sinners?

Inadequate religious instruction seems to have unbalanced faith. Long ago it was realized that "the consciousness of sin is fundamental to a complete realization of what the religious life means." May it be that in the absence of the proper presentation of grace, the atonement and the victory of Jesus over death, that the great emphasis which was placed on the sinfulness of man— contrasted so strongly with the consequent holiness of Christ— thus prepared the way toward intercession of saints, who must have seemed nearer to themselves as well as nearer to their God?

Other harmful misconceptions and doctrines which, when out of focus, would become prolific sources of this error were: recognizing God only as an angry Judge; embellished reports of answers to the prayers of fathers and mothers in the faith, and the mechanical and vain repetition of real wonders wrought by prayer; incorrect or incomplete views of Jesus, e. g., seeking still to present some merit by which to secure mercy and salvation; the distressing needs and injustices of life, to which no one seemed to give adequate attention; the infallibility of the church; the conception that religion was a scheme by and through which people could manage to get God to do their will; the whole conception of the office of the priesthood, by which worshippers were taught to use human agencies to approach God; an undue emphasis upon the holiness of sanctuaries; the survival of many Old Testament concep-

tions of "holiness" and "uncleanness" and "sacrifices" and "ceremonials."

On the other hand let credit be given these Christian people for recognizing something in the lives of noble and saintly Christians which could not be accounted for apart from the presence and power of Jesus.

THE TEST OF SAINT WORSHIP

Yet another phase: the test of saint worship must be mentioned. What was the fruit of it? Aside from the abuses connected therewith, it had an inherent weakness. Did creative spirituality result from the forsaking of the Incarnate Christ for the fainter traces of his presence in sanctified but imperfect creatures? Has saint worship produced what is produced when Christ is given the central place in spiritual life and worship?

Did worship of saints help people to experience God? "Worship, of whatever sort, which will help us to this power to live in the loyalty of God, that worship is indeed good and right. But worship, no matter what its complexity or symbolism, or its simplicity and formalism, which is offered in the name of God as a substitute for a real experience with God as the power for a right life—this is an abomination and a deceit."[13]

It was not the presence of adiaphora but the absence of essentials which vitiated their worship and which condemns the practice. This is stated picturesquely by Luther in giving his opinion of the Mark-Brandenburg order of 1540:

> If the Margrave and Electors will have the Gospel preached in its purity, without human additions, and the two sacraments administered according to their institution, and will discontinue the intercession of saints, and the carrying of the sacraments in procession, and masses for the dead, and abolish holy water, and consecrated salt and herbs, and will have pure responsories and hymns sung in processions, then let him go on in God's name, whether he have a silver or a golden cross carried, or wear a cap and gown of velvet, silk or linen; and if one cap and gown be not enough, let him put on three like Aaron; and if one

13 Meeser, Spenser B., in Crozer Quarterly, April, 1929, p. 227.

procession be not enough, let them go around seven times, like Joshua; and if the Margrave should care about dancing with the music of harps and cymbals, as David did before the ark, I am satisfied. For such things neither add anything to the Gospel nor remove anything from it, if only they be not regarded as necessary for salvation or made a matter of conscience.[14]

LUTHER'S DEVELOPMENT FROM INVOCATION OF SAINTS

Luther's development from Romanist to the Augustana position regarding invocation of saints is constructive and positive, if slow and late. There is of course the presence of antagonistic influences. Luther condemned the materialistic, carnal and selfish objectives of the prayers addressed to saints. He urged the people to pray for spiritual blessings. Luther objected strenuously to the abuses connected with the practice which actually robbed the deluded people in the form of exorbitant and innumerable fees. Luther did not believe in the authority of the hierarchy to canonize saints. These and many other negative positions were furnished a solid foundation of truth by the positive positions growing out of the nature of Luther's theological teachings and system, the positive tenets of his faith and practice.

Luther did condemn the substitution of human effort and merit for Jesus' way of life. He condemns the "saintish, legalistic ascetics, merit-seeking recluses, the holier-than-thou kind of saints"—"those externally showy saints." He commends the saintliness of a Christlike Stephen.

The reason we are Christian is because we have Christ with all his merit and worthiness, not because of our efforts and works, which indeed make a St. Carthusius, a St. Francis, or an Augustinian monk, and obedient servant and extremist as they are called; but such works can never make a Christian.[15]

Under date of December 31, 1517, he writes:

You ask me, excellent Spalatin, what I would think of publishing some theses asserting that the worship of saints for temporal goods is superstitious. It was never my idea to call veneration of the

14 DeWette, *Luther's Letters.*
15 From "A Sermon on Christian Righteousness," 1529.

saints superstitious, even when they are invoked for the most worldly causes.... But I would say that it is superstitious, or rather impious and perverse, to pray God and the saints for temporal goods exclusively, and not rather for the goods of the soul and salvation and the will of God, etc.[16]

Luther invoked saints long after he began preaching justification by faith alone. He tried to purify saint worship by elevating its uses and lifting it above its abuses. But he finally had to denounce it: it was incompatible with the Christocentric character of his teaching and faith.

It is interesting to watch Luther emerge. In referring to the spiritual poverty of his youth he tells how in home and church, "hungering souls were directed away from Christ to Mary and the saints, and for spiritual food were offered empty legends. Christ, upon the other hand, he learned to know only as a stern judge, striking terror to the hearts of men."[17] But he was a faithful believer, and a good sample of the product of such teaching. "Christ, as the only true Advocate and Mediator, was hidden from the eyes of those who prayed. When Luther's life was threatened by an accidental injury, he called upon the Virgin Mary in his distress, and would have died, he afterwards relates, depending upon her."[18]

Later, when wrestling with doubt and filled with a dread of the judgment, "He fled for refuge to supposed available mediators before God, seeking to find outside of himself a 'rock and foundation for prayer' but he selected for this purpose 'not Christ, but St. George, St. Vincent, etc.' "[19] Because he regarded Jesus as a stern Judge he avoided him.

As late as 1516 his faith in the intercession of the saints remained unshaken. He regarded the Virgin Mary as especially an object of veneration.[20] In his *Lectures upon the Decalogue* that year, he probably reached

16 Smith, *Luther's Correspondence*, Vol. I, p. 66.
17 Koestlin, *Theology of Luther*, trans. by Hay, Vol. I, p. 29.
18 Koestlin, *op. cit.*, p. 47.
19 Koestlin, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
20 Koestlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 200 ff.

the point of his greatest loyalty to the doctrine when he maintained that we should by all means hold fast our faith in the intercession of the saints.

But the very intensity of this plea, together with the accompanying denunciations of false miracles, lying legends, and counterfeit relics, may indicate that the truth he held and preached was so leavening his thinking that he could no longer hold undisturbed a doctrine he had practiced through thirty-three years of life and terrific struggles. The hold of the practice upon him manifests itself four years later when he exhorts his readers to call upon "the Mother of God and all the apostles and the dear saints." In 1521 when expounding the Magnificat he expresses the wish, "Would that the same tender mother of God might secure for me the spirit to properly and thoroughly expound this her song." So the saints seem gradually to fade out of the picture until Mary alone is left.

This seems to be the surface view. What was going on in his heart may be indicated by a study of the greater articles of his faith and practice. The proper view of his emergence is that he did not change *from* a practice of the church, either theoretically or practically, so much as he changed *to* a loyalty to the truth that necessarily eliminated the doctrine of the invocation of saints.

To him Christ was the center of theology and religion. In 1521 this truth was leading him away from saint worship. On the second Sunday in Advent he

> avails himself of the words of the apostle glorifying the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, to emphasize a warning against any worshipping of saints in which the worshipper does not press on into the presence of God himself. He is filled with anxiety lest an abominable idolatry may by such means be introduced. He grants that some employ the worship of saints and of the mother of God in a proper spirit. Nevertheless, it seems to him to be a dangerous custom, which should not be observed in the general congregation.[21]

The light was breaking through.

Later Luther himself confesses that "he does not know how nor when he ceased to address prayers to saints, contenting himself with the one Christ and God and

21 Koestlin, *op. cit.*, p. 466.

Father."[22] Even when his faith in the intercession of saints was still strong two significant characteristics are noticeable, 1) the absence of the mention of saints in his discourses (though he does mention at least ten saints in Vol. I of his *Commentary on the Psalms*), letters and conversations, and 2) whenever he presents the way of salvation he directs people to believe in Christ alone. In a letter to Christians at Erfurt written in 1522,

> he writes that, although it is not necessary to invoke the saints, he yet does not think that one who does so should be condemned, if he only do not place his confidence in them, since what such a one does to them is done to Christ, because Christ is in them and they in Christ. We should therefore bear with the weak. We must, at any rate, all at last forsake the saints and ourselves, to know nothing but of Christ, and let all else go (Koestlin, p. 467).

Thus was he led in a fine spirit of sympathy for human weakness, by a keen understanding of human nature, and an unwavering loyalty to Christ to finally reject the practice.

In a sermon on I Cor. 12:1-11 (Tenth Sunday after Trinity) Luther said:

> They [monks] have in a way highly extolled Jesus, have in words honored and worshipped his name and used it to clothe all their lying nonsense and idolatry. For instance, they exalt Mary as the mother of Jesus and Anna as his grandmother. But they have thus torn men's hearts away from Christ, turning over to Mary and the saints the honor due him alone, and teaching the people to invoke these as mediators and intercessors having powers to protect us in the hour of death. This is substituting dumb idols for Christ. No saint has ever taught such things; still less does the word of God enjoin them.... There have been many Christians who though possessing the Holy Spirit, were not 'administrators'; for instance Virgins and wives—Agnes, Anastasia and others—and martyrs many of whom wrought miracles and had other gifts. True, both gifts and workings are imparted chiefly for the execution of Christian duties.[23]

Even when he condemns saint worship, he would cast no reflection upon the holiness of the saints.

Luther held the word of God to be the final authority.

22 Koestlin, *op. cit.*, p. 467.
23 *Luthers Werke*, Erlangen Ed., Vol. 9.

How did this affect the doctrine of the intercession of saints? Dr. Koestlin commenting on a sermon of Luther preached in 1521 says: "It seemed to him at the outset, a suspicious circumstance that it has the support of no scriptural text or example, but that it rather contradicts those passages which teach us to place all our confidence in God."

Two years later, "he insisted that the invocation of saints should no longer find a place in the regulations of hymns of the church." His views of that year are given in a pamphlet published seven years later, in which he states that he will hear nothing further of the intercession of saints, "since it is not becoming in us to undertake anything in the worship of God without a commandment of God." At last he has become a consistent practitioner of his theology.

And it was this tenet of his faith which led him, first, "to doubt the authority of the Pope in the matter of canonization, and even the significance, or benefit, of canonization itself," and later to deny it. Further application of the principle is seen in his Sermon on John 21:19-24:

> Do you then reply: Alas, shall we not follow the lives and examples of the holy saints? Why are they then preached? Answer: One should preach them so as to preach God in them, to stir up one another, and to comfort one another by his goodness and grace and not show forth their works, but their obedience in their works.

In a sermon on John 3:16 he says:

> If I had all the merits of all the saints, the sanctity and purity of all the virgins, and the piety of St. Peter besides, still I would not give a fig for all I call my own. I must have another foundation on which to build, namely, the words: God has given his Son, that whosoever believeth on him, whom the Father sent out of love, shall be saved.... Let not your conscience trust in any work, in any merit of saints, but alone in the Word of God.[24]

Luther was not alone in this position. Calvin reproved Butzer in a letter written Jan. 12, 1538:

> After you have said that the veneration of Saints is produced in human superstition rather than founded in God's word, you add at

24 *Luthers Werke*, Erlangen Ed., Vol. 12.

once, that one must, nevertheless, consider the writings of the church-fathers, and that a veneration, recommended by them, ought not to be entirely condemned. Thus you re-introduce constantly that authority by which every error can be represented as truth.[25]

Luther taught that believers had direct access to God in prayer. Let his own language show how impossible it was for him to continue invoking saints and hold his faith:

Therefore thou shouldst say: 'My prayer is as precious, holy and pleasing to God as that of St. Paul or of the most holy saints', and ... 'I will gladly grant that he is holier in his person, but not on account of the person, but on account of obedience thereto. Yet the reason is this: I rest my prayer upon the same Commandment with those of all the saints and besides I pray for the same thing and for the same reason for which they pray and ever have prayed; and therefore it is as precious to me, as well as much more needful, as to those great saints.' This is the first and most important point, that all our prayers are based and rest upon obedience to God, irrespective of our person, whether we be sinners or saints, worthy or unworthy.[26]

From another source comes this gem:

You can point me no true saint who prayed, depending upon his own worthiness, and who did not rely only upon God's promises be he Peter, Paul, Mary, Elijah, or any one else. ... All of them have been unworthy. I would not give a nickel for all the prayers of a saint if he prayed because of his own worthiness.[27]

Where in this view of prayer is there any reason for the intercessory powers of saints?

Luther's view of faith and works depleted to a vanishing point the merit of the saints as intercessors. We see in a very modern contemporary movement a demonstration of this principle. It would be unwarranted and colossal pride, and of course untrue, to say that the spread of Lutheran theology into literature had given birth to the movement to deprive the great heroes of the past of their legendary glories. But it is true that the modern seeker after the truth has stripped many a mighty "saint" in the glowing annals of pseudo-history by the removal of

25 *Calv. Opp.* 10, p. 142.
26 *The Large Catechism*, Part III, Prayer.
27 Lenker, *Luther's Works*, Vol. III, p. 169.

"wings" and "rays" and "halos" which may have been artificially attached to them by their admiring worshippers. At its best this movement results in a revaluation of external works and places a new emphasis upon creative spirit—upon a conquering faith. At its worst it ends in its attempt to "wash dirty linen" by soiling otherwise clean vessels.

Luther is finally driven in his usual enthusiasm to strong denunciations of the doctrine.

> The papists took the invocation of saints from the heathen, who divided God into numberless images and idols, and ordained each its peculiar office and work.... The invocation of saints is a most abominable blindness and heresy; yet the papists will not give it up. The pope's greatest profit arises from the dead; for the calling on saints brings him infinite sums of money and riches, far more than he gets from the living.[28]

The apologists at Augsburg in their confession and conflict were not driven from Rome's doctrine concerning the intercession of saints. They were lifted out of it by the powerful truth they loyally espoused and heroically obeyed.

The addition of Article XXI, which was not in the preliminary drafts of the confession, is itself a testimony to the authors' heroic loyalty to the truth, their sense of proper balance and appreciation of the truth, their keen insight into the far-reaching applications of the positive and formative principles of the Reformation. Article XXI is demanded by the other twenty, both from an analytic and a synthetic viewpoint. It presents and is used as a superb occasion to apply the truth dearly loved by the Protestants against a practice dearly loved by the Catholic church. It certainly required Calvarian courage to attack an appealing custom of a thousand years standing.

The unity of the confession is superb. The articles of the Augustana are twenty-one in number, but through each is found the Christocentric character of the whole. Touching all of them is the principle of the authority of

28 *Luther's Table Talk*, No. LXXVIII.

the Word of God. The dominant place of a vital faith is always in sight as we explore the landscape of this doctrinal statement. One cannot draw near to any one article without approaching all of them.

THE SPIRIT OF THE CONTEST AT AUGSBURG

The spirit of Christ in Philippus and Martinus as manifested in their handling of this delicate situation and in their attitude toward their opponents is most impressive. There is an absence of all contentiousness. There is no vindictiveness. There was no abusive narrowness.

Castellio wrote Calvin who had not disapproved of the burning of Servetus: "To burn a man is not to defend a doctrine: it is to burn a man."

"At the present time," says Bishop Mouzon, commenting on the spirit of the Reformers, "when so many dogmatists are insisting that a theology correct in all particulars is to be required of all who profess to follow Jesus, and when so many abusive epithets are being hurled at good men who hold contrary views it would be well to remember that *to abuse a man is not to defend a doctrine; it is to abuse a man.*"

Self-appointed defenders of the faith and all contenders for the faith today would do well to consider the courteous language of the Augsburg confessors of the faith, and the Christlike spirit of their attitude toward those who differed with them.

Witness the generous terms and attitude ingrained in the statement: "Of the invocation of the saints, both sides agree that it not expressly commanded in the Scriptures."[29] Or note the Lutherans' statement of August 18, 1530.

> On the twenty-first article we are agreed in regard to two points, namely, that the saints and angels with God in heaven pray for us; and the custom of the church, which cherishes the memory of the saints and prays God to assist us by the prayers of the church, is Christian and is to be held. But as regards the invocation of the saints we are agreed in this, namely, that there exists no express

29 Richard, J. W., *The Confessional History of the Lutheran Church*, p. 162.

command of the Scriptures which enjoins upon any one the invocation of the saints. But as to whether the saints according to the received custom of the universal church may be invoked with intention—on this there is difference of opinion, since the Elector, the princes and other allies regard it doubtful and as dangerous on account of the many abuses, and because there is no express scripture for it.[30]

If Melanchthon is the great Preceptor of Germany, he is also under the revealing test of this great doctrinal disputation, a splendid example of the indwelling Spirit of Jesus. The exhibit of the spirit of Jesus by these reformers is perhaps the best explanation of the success of the Reformation.

When we consider all the angles and viewpoints entering into the Augsburg contest, the strength of habit and training of life in its holiest engagements, the outspoken authority of the church defending, commending and commanding, two things stand out in bold relief: 1) The abuses connected with invocation of saints, financial, psychological, and ecclesiastical must have been revoltingly extreme and 2) The spirit of the reformation with its emphasis is upon Christ, the Word of God, a vital faith, and Christian freedom must have been inspiring and full of boundless enthusiasm in its effect upon the rank and file.

There is significance in the fact that invocation and worship of saints appears to have dropped out of the religious practices of Protestantism. So far as I know it has canonized no saints.

> Who would Saint Bunyan say
> Or to his spirit pray?

The contestants at Augsburg maintained a remarkable devotion to the truth. They opposed intercession of saints, but retained all that was good in imitation, gratitude, inspiration and honor of the saints. They did not permit themselves to be divorced from the truth, their brethren, or the spirit of Christ. What a challenge to the followers who walk under the banner of the Augustana.

30 Forstermann's *Urkundenbuch*, p. 235.

One further evidence of their grasp of the whole truth in this doctrine appears in Luther's preface to the revised edition of the German Psalter of 1531. Here he declares that nothing essential was lost in denying saint worship and he endeavors to lift the mind and heart to higher levels of appreciation of the saints.

In the past years there was handed about almost nothing but a multitude of legends of saints, passionals, lives of saints; and the world was so filled with them, that the psalter lay under the seat, and in such great darkness, that not one psalm was rightly understood; nevertheless, it shed abroad such an excellent precious fragrance that all pious hearts drew devotion and power even from the unknown words, and the book was therefore dear to them....

For my part, I think that a finer book of lives and legends of the saints has never appeared in the earth, nor ever can appear, than the Psalter. For if one were to desire that out of all the lives, legends, and histories the best were picked out and brought together and set forth to the best advantage; why, the book thus produced would be just the Psalter we now have: For here we find not what one or two saints only have done, but what the Head himself of all the saints has done, and what all the saints still do: how they are affected towards God, towards friends, and towards foes; how they bear themselves and act in every sort of peril and tribulation.

THE WORSHIP OF SAINTS IN THE CONTEMPORARY PROTESTANT CHURCH

The proper approach to the contemporary church is a study of its antecedents. The importance of historical study is set forth by Eugene W. Lyman in a recent number of The Journal of Religion.[31]

I. Theeology should be concerned for depth and riches in religious experience and for its fruitfulness in all of life.... Religious experience, rightly interpreted, results not in disillusionment but in discovery, not in the expression of life, but in its fulfillment, not in inertness in the face of the great issues of mankind, but in alertness to discern them and in resourcefulness for meeting them victoriously.

II. Theology should recognize the deep rootage of religious experience in history and should interpret religion's present mean-

31 "The Place of Christ in Modern Theology," The Journal of Religion, April, 1929.

ing and future development in the light of this fact.... The important revivals of Christianity have always been nourished by a fresh discovery of the essential greatness of its history. Theology exists, in part, to put the plow into Christian history and turn up its subsoil, in order that modern Christianity may have the fertility needed for new harvests; ...vital religious experience draws from history an indispensable nutriment.... It is theology's part to make known to us, if it can, the vitamines of great religious experience.

III. Theology should recognize religion's need for a comprehensive philosophy...the metaphysical kinship of the human spirit with ultimate reality.

How well the Augsburg theologians followed this method in their confessional conflict! What of the church today?

The saints are much in evidence in the contemporary church. In the revised Book of Common Prayer proposed recently for parliamentary approval one prayer contains a petition "for those we no longer see." A great many congregations pray the saints in song. They may not do so wittingly. But in many churches throughout the land people lustily call on the hosts of heaven to praise God when they sing:

> Praise God, from whom all blessings flow,
> Praise Him, all creatures here below;
> Praise Him above, ye heavenly host;
> Praise Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Yet the appearance of any prayer for or to the saints or sinners beyond death is extremely rare in the devotional literature and practice in Protestantism. It is, however, significant that "saints" are mentioned in 52 of the 578 hymns of our hymnal.[32]

The modern process of creating saints of those who

32 *Common Service Book and Hymnal.* See hymns 4, 13, 14, 26, 27, 50, 72, 102, 132, 135, 158, 175, 176, 184, 198, 202, 247 (10), 249, 250, 251, 281, 284, 300, 305, 311, 338, 344, 378, 379, 383, 388, 394, 409, 422, 425, 426, 428, 443, 460, 483, 499, 505, 513, 515, 518, 519, 520, 521, 523, 525, 528, 564. More than twice as many more hymns refer to the saints under the terms and phrases: "those in bright array," "blessed spirits," "heavenly throng," "hosts celestial," "church victorious," "our friends above," "that blessed throng," "the glorious band" and such like. The word saints in the above hymns covers the "saints below and the saints above."

have gone on before calls for the same marks as of old. They must have had contact with the Divine. They must have excelled in great struggles, service, and sacrifice. They must have a spiritual insight into things unseen. They must have manifested zeal and enthusiasm for the Christ and the church. They must have suffered for the truth's sake. Their lives must have had the fruits of the Spirit.

There is a bond of sympathy and understanding between all believers and saints. Someone has rightly said: "You are not all saints, but nearly all of you have hours of saintliness, flights of pure love." Says J. Middleton Murray, "Paul was a great man; Simon had only his moments of greatness: but the greatness of Simon in his great moments was nearer to the greatness of Jesus than Paul's ever was." Whether or not this is a true estimate of these great master Christians, it contains a great principle of sainthood.

Sometimes we miss the mark by manufacturing saints. We "create" saints in the image of our ideals. We take certain frameworks of human living and cover them with astonishing embellishments. We watermark the "saintliness" of souls whom we admire with our own personality. Without the control of a central authority to canonize, saintmaking sometimes goes astray today as in days of old.

ALL SAINTS DAY

Turning to the nobler side of the modern church's attitude, we find many evidences that the church is quite literally obeying the requirement of this article to honor saints.

Pope Boniface IV instituted the *festum omnium Sanctorum* in 610 A. D. Already there were so many saints that it was impossible to dedicate a day to each. The revival in the Protestant church of All Saints Day (November 1) is for the purpose, not of worshipping creatures, but "that the memory of the saints may be set before us," to stimulate us "to follow their faith and good works."

The celebration of All Saints Day has become regular in the calendar of some congregations because of another development. There is a tendency to simplify the burial service, omitting sermon and hymns. Then once a year before the whole congregation an appropriate service is held (on All Saints Day, if possible). At this service some suitable mention is made of those who have departed this life during the year. Such a service can be made a fruitful source of much good, and need not degenerate into a eulogizing or whitewashing festival.

But in the real significance of All Saints Day many churches are endeavoring so to celebrate this festival that the church may fulfill the threefold method of honoring the saints as set forth in the Apology, in Article XXI.

The new emphasis upon worship in the contemporary church, which has brought into greater uses the symbolism, the creations and the memory of the saints is accompanied by some insidious dangers. For example, consider those who worship for selfish enjoyment and not to create and nurture those impulses which issue in nobler living and service. Again observe that worship which seeks satisfaction of the worshippers' indwelling hunger for righteousness by a sort of substitutionary (vicarious) entrance into the holiness of saints without living a holy life of their own.

THE SAINTS IN MUSIC AND ART

This article is being obeyed more effectively in the music and art of the church. The great hymns of the great saints are coming into frequent use. Bach and the great masters are allowed to use the organ. The Magnificat, the Te Deum Laudamus, the Nunc Dimittis the Gloria in Excelsis and similar creations of the saints are lifting the praise of the church heavenward. The imperishable masterpieces in hymns and harmonies from the great souls of the saints, from Clement of Alexandria down, become the ladder to heaven upon which the praise of the people ascends to God. We do ourselves more honor than the saints when we use these hymns and their

historic prayers. But by these instruments the saints of old yet live among us and serve. The truth is being mediated to us through the songs and prayers of the saints.

Another way the contemporary church is honoring the saints is in architectural art. We are building many churches. By good authority we are told that New York City is constantly at work on eighty new churches. We are building some costly churches. We are building more beautiful churches. Into these houses of worship we have brought the saints in symbol and beauty. We have sculptured them into stone and marble and precious metal. They have been carved into wood. We have encased some of them in gold. These images look down upon the worshipper from pillar, choir, transept, nave and sanctuary. The sunlight illumines countless saints imprisoned in art glass. The artist's brush adds a generous quota in murals and altar paintings. The whole realm of church history is explored to find a new saint to visualize in the house of God.

Of old they invoked the saints to intercede for them at the majestic throne above. Now we use the grace, beauty and symbolism of the images of the saints, here below, to help us into an atmosphere conducive to worship and holiness, that we, ourselves, may succeed better in our approach to the throne of grace.

"They teach that the memory of the saints may be set before us." Apparently and evidently the church is doing so. In the aggregate, millions of dollars are being spent to set before the church the memory of the saints. This is accomplished through many avenues and channels.

Our art windows sieve the sunlight through the striking colors of the saints in their saintly robes. Some windows are filled with saints who have found their way there from within the church. Some figures now to be found in the art windows of cathedrals, churches and chapels seem to have entered from the outside—the world side. Among the figures of ancient saints there may now be found in carving or color the figure of a modern, perhaps a statesman, an educator, an architect, an athlete or

even a sportsman. This, of course, originates from the desire to abolish the great gap between the so-called sacred and secular. In this age of professed passionate search for the truth, we are to find, among the array of saints, the figures of fictional and legendary characters.

> The student of humanity will recognize with reverence the indications of the pathetic yearning after some outward form in which to express the veneration felt for those set apart from the rest of their race by real or supposed intercourse with the Divine.[33]

There are times when these images intrude. They get between the worshipper and his God. Then let him "lift his eyes to the eternal hills from whence cometh his help." The mood of the poet is sometimes the heart of the worshipper. A country church:

> I think God feels Himself the owner here,
> Not just rich host to some self-seeking throng
> But Friend of village folk who want Him near
> And offer Him simplicity and song.
>
> No stained glass windows hide the world from view,
> And it is well. The world is lovely there,
> Beyond clear panes, where branch-scrolled skies look through,
> And fields and hills, in morning hours of prayer.
>
> God spent His youth with field and hill and tree
> And Christ grew up in rural Galilee.[34]

And while poor taste and radicalism may manifest themselves in this as well as other fields of human endeavor, there is a marked tendency to honor the true saints, in such a manner that the embryonic saints, through their worship and work, rise from the sinner to a nobler faith.

A non-Lutheran from America thus describes his recent visit to a church in the city of Weimar, where Luther preached and Bach played the organ. The thing which left upon him an "unforgettable impression" was the so-called churchliness, which he rejoices that "Puritanism did not destroy." Hear his witness:

33 Bell, N., *The Saints in Christian Art.*, Vol. I, Preface.
34 V. A. Storey.

As we sat in the church at Weimar, with only the east end lighted up, our eyes rested upon the magnificent altar-painting of Cranach wherein is depicted the Lord, slain and risen; by the side of the Crucified stands Luther, his finger on the opened Bible where it stands written that the blood of Jesus Christ our Lord cleanseth us from all sin. As we meditated upon this, one of Bach's most splendid phantasies was played upon the organ. In Lutheranism, as we saw it here and in the chapel on the Wartburg, we found a solemn dignity combined with an enthusiastic loyalty to a Protestant tradition.[35]

The house of prayer is no longer likely to be mistaken for the place of business, or entertainment.

RESTUDYING THE SAINTS

The restudy, re-evaluation, and interpretation of the lives of the saints is another engagement of the contemporary church which is doing much to arouse our faith and stimulate our growth in righteousness. Religious books head the list of non-fiction in number published last year. Biographical studies form a large percentage of the published volumes. Some ancient saints like Augustine and Saint Francis never lose their charm. Bunyan, the Tinker, still preaches the Pilgrim's Progress. And many other souls have stood the acid test of merciless research and shine as stars of greater or lesser magnitude.

> Lives of great men still remind us
> We can make our lives sublime.

I dare say, we need no creed to command us to honor the saints or adopt them as examples. Some of the discoveries of literary and historical scholarship prove that we have been unduly hasty and generous in "canonizing" some who have had sainthood thrust upon them. Some "saints" are being dethroned. The search for foibles and faults and the consequent exploitation of real and fancied sins has become a popular pastime. It is as if modern cynicism said, we cannot be saints, therefore we will tear all saints from their pedestals and exhibit only their defects. But yet we do not forget that if we demanded per-

35 Nathaniel Micklem in The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought, Oct., 1928.

fection of saints there would be no memorials to commemorate their great deeds.

Yet diligent study and patient research has born good fruit. "New facts of undoubted authenticity have been added to the received biography of the saints." Some persistent legends have been explained. And in some cases, "long deferred justice has been done to the memory of some misjudged sufferer for the faith." All this recognition of saints will be profitable if it functions in makng us better men and women here and now.

A greater problem, however, is to secure the fulfillment of this article of the creed of the church by the elevation of the worship function of the contemporary church. "This Christ is to be invocated."

All worship is condemned that does not detach from the mean, the sinful, the worldly. That worship is condemned which rises no higher than a mechanical imitation of an imperfect creature, particularly that kind of veneration which relies upon the defects of a great one to approve or at least condone the worshipper's sins. That worship is condemned which rises not at all. All worship is condemned which rises not to God our Creator, our Saviour, our Sanctifier.

> Admiration is not all. If it is real, it must go on to imitation. When we have the grit to follow some unselfish line of action, perhaps against our inclination, we soon 'get into the spirit of it'—which is another way of saying that the spirit is taking hold of us. The effect of Christ's life down through the centuries has always operated in this familiar area of admiration and imitation, and in the experience of being suffered for. Since his day we have never discovered any new way of handling selfishness.[36]

Christ is the Way. That Way involves the way of the cross. In our worship, Jesus must be our living Lord, our Advocate, our Mediator, our Way, the Truth and the Life.

"There are eight things which our average worshipper most needs for the fulness of life... Wisdom (plain, downright, clear thinking), Vision, Self-understanding, Puri-

36 Robert R. Wicks, *Preaching in the New Era*, p. 171.

fication, Empowerment, Faith, Resolution, The experience of selfhood with God."[37] Whether we agree or not with the importance, order or completeness of these suggested needs, they form a starting point for the thesis that the worship which engages our being in its moments of highest aspirations and sacred intimacies with the Divine should be so intelligently understood and so purely practiced that the false, the vain, the sham, and the meaningless shall be eliminated. Our worship must have Jesus in it. Our worship must lead to the enthronement of Jesus in our hearts and lives.

Just as Luther, Melanchthon and their coworkers eliminated from the worship of their day that practice which was conducive to simony, to deception, and to diversion of the worshipper from Christ, so must we today strive to lead the worship of God's children until they shall "go from strength to strength" in the amiable tabernacle of the Lord of hosts, in whose courts a day is better than a thousand.

"The saints are to be imitated as examples in doing good."[38] The two important words in this statement of the doctrine's requirement are "imitated" and "examples." Education, psychology and experience testify to the value of such a use of saints. The program of Christian education is partly built upon this principle. In every way and in every grade, saints are harnessed to instruct and inspire. The materials from sainthood cover a wide range, from pictures to philosophy.

SOME EVILS IN SAINT WORSHIP REAPPEARING IN CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS LIFE

Holding to an inadequate conception of Christ is probably worse than using a mere saint as our advocate with God. Incorrect conceptions of Christ assisted in the development of saint worship and its evils. Luther somewhere testifies:

37 Prof. Henry P. VanDusen.
38 Richard, J. W., *Confessional History of the Lutheran Church*, p. 117.

It is the common practice to represent the gracious Savior as a Judge, and from this practice has sprung a dependence on the merits of saints, causing us to turn away from Christ and take refuge in the saints. We fancy that the saints are more gracious and more kindly disposed to us than even God himself. Therefore one says, St. Peter is my apostle! another says St. Paul is my patron, and so on with St. Barbara, St. Erasmus and others.

MODERN HUMANISM

Some tendencies in modern humanism are doing this very thing. It is leading people away from the Lord Jesus, to a mere man Jesus, fancying that the man Jesus is easier to understand, and more sympathetic. Who can be more merciful than God, who is Love? Prof. Lyman remarks: "Jesus cannot be to us at one and the same time a supremely creative personality and the composite result of the thought of later generations of Christians."

In other words if we construct our mediator after the image of our own idea, that is not *the* Mediator, our only Advocate, Jesus. Jesus may be but a name to us. Jesus may represent our own constructed saviour. But however loyal we may be to our own image of Christ, that will not necessarily bring us into touch with the Living, Life-giving Jesus.

When Jesus ceases to be the vital center of our religious life our supreme objective changes from the passion to experience God and to create a Christian community to the objective of a personal appropriation of the benefits of religion for selfish advancement here and hereafter. The history clustering about this Article warns us against holding an inadequate conception of Jesus our Lord.

The position of the behavioristic psychologist in religion offers an interesting thought. He holds that religion is the effort of a person to live up to the best of which he is capable in himself. Saint worship might be considered the social side of such a religious philosophy. At least there would be very little difference of merit between worshipping the saint in glory and worshipping the saint *in posse*.

Whatever the faults and failures of a strong emphasis upon the scholastic viewpoint in present day theological

study still Jesus Christ usually is given the central place. Note Prof. Eugene W. Lyman's reply to the question, "What is the place of Christ in modern theology?"

I. Jesus Christ is central for our thought of God and of man, for our ideals and for our way of life, because in him moral and spiritual creativity are so supremely embodied.

II. The place of Jesus Christ in modern Theology should be central because from him we learn a religion by which moral and spiritual creativeness may be steadily sustained and nourished.

III. Jesus Christ has a central place in theological thought because he was the personal embodiment of truths which are permanently central for the spiritual life of mankind.

The terminology used by Dr. Lyman may not be satisfactory to all. But his statements upon the necessary Christocentric character of Christianity are emphatic. Saint worship decentralized Christ from mediaeval worship. Anything that today removes Christ from the central place in our faith, worship and life is merely repeating the evils of saint worship. When any one responds to that which dethrones Christ, the living Lord of Lords, he is falling into a mediaeval error.

MODERN ABUSES IN PRAYER

It is in order to inquire into some modern abuses in prayer. "Christ hath promised he will hear our prayers." Luther's point of departure from the doctrine of invocation of the saints was a condemnation of the practice of invoking saints and angels for materialistic gain. At that point in his development into the Protestant, and perhaps much later, Luther would have expressed a preference for an invocation of the saints—the Virgin Mary included—to the perversion of prayer which subjects all spiritual things to material gain and advancement. Is contemporary Christianity free from this error? The principle of relativity just applied to the field of magnetism has long been applied to prayer and worship.

One might well raise the question whether the vain repetition of sentences and words is in any sense better than the act of a sincere if misguided soul, seeking diligently to approach God via the incorrect method of in-

voking saints. If we keep our Creed, Article XXI, we must imitate the Reformers and make a courageous attempt to rescue contemporary prayer and worship from practices that are unscriptural, and sterile—a reflection upon the worshipper and his God.

In this day we ask "in Jesus' Name." This is well, but we must not thrust upon him, our Mediator, that which is our own duty. We are instructed to approach the Father direct. When we pray, say "Our Father." We may evade our privilege as "children" of God and cast reflections upon him whom we should love and who is Love, when we seek to approach him indirectly—faithless, as it were. Did not Jesus say, "And I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you. For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God" (John 16:26-27)?

THE PROPER PLACE OF THE SAINTS

If Dr. Rufus Jones is right in his statement that "the largest single denomination in the world today is the church of the Seekers," then our great opportunity to keep our Creed (Art. XXI) is diligently to lead these "Seekers" after God from improper channels and bypaths to the Way, just as our fathers in the faith renounced the incorrect medium and set forth emphatically the true Mediator. And what a task presents itself when we contemplate the vast army of seekers, the tremendous importance of the search, and the priceless Pearl that awaits the searcher who is willing to sell all that he has to possess the Truth.

In the Russian Orthodox church there are many ikons. The kissing of these pictures of saints and the bowing before them punctuates the liturgical service of the corporate worship. Dr. G. G. Kullman of Zurich, remarks:

> Any sincere observer of Orthodox liturgical worship will agree that out of the symbols themselves there flows toward the worshipper a 'wave' of other-worldly holiness which takes irresistible hold of him. The worshipper experiences unmistakably the divine presence. God takes hold of his church.[39]

39 Hibbert Journal, January, 1929, p. 243.

My experience in worshipping in an Orthodox church, standing with the faithful through a service of nearly four hours duration, confirms this observation. Our Protestant ideal is opposed to the Orthodox view of these symbols which are held by them to be "God-chosen channels by which God comes down to men." The Orthodox is a paradox to the Protestant. But he has managed to use his symbols to create the atmosphere of worship. Let us learn to manage our symbols to glorify God thereby.

We condemn the idolatry which exalts images of the dead; but let us make certain that we fall not into a deadness of a worship wherein the means of Grace are used as "lovely" forms in a "faithless" and therefore "lifeless" repetition.

Christian worship will always have room for the spontaneous element. But reckless elasticity of liturgy is as deadly as lifeless liturgy. Extremes are bad. One tends to deify the leader of the worship, and the other, to deify the saints who created the forms. Is there a tendency today to hold the sayings and works of saints as final or authoritative guides of thought and life? May there be a loyalty to institutions and customs founded by the saints which delays the growth of the Kingdom? If those saints were here now, virile leaders of this day and generation, might they not be the first to depart from these ancient ways and creations? While we build upon the foundation laid by those who have gone on before, does not their spirit impel us to venture beyond any and all of their achievements? What did he mean when he said: "Greater works than these shall ye do?" In present day emphasis upon original sources, historicity, and traditions, is there not a danger of depending on those things which are themselves derived from Deity? We can worship saints in this way also. "Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace" (Heb. 4:16).

We would not attempt to read new meanings into this tenet. Nor would we set forth Article XXI as a creedal shibboleth. We wish merely to point to the principle of

a living dynamic faith functioning, through communion with God, through *our* one Mediator, by the grace of God, to create Christian character and conduct.

Creeds persist in spite of efforts to abolish formal statements of faith. A modern churchman says:[40]

> Let it be remarked that the final test of the value of any theology is to be found in the character of the men who accept that theology. For it does matter immensely what a man believes. It is extremely superficial to discount the importance of creedal statements. Three things are vitally related the one to the other—creed, character, and conduct. For just as the flower springs out of the stem, and just as the fruit grows out of the flower, so does character spring out of the creed and so does conduct grow out of character.

Creeds must be true. They must be vital: Let us therefore take Article XXI off the shelf and draft it for service in vitalizing modern worship and religious leadership.

No leader of worship should get between the worshipper and God. The requirement of this Article is realized when the minister leading the worshippers becomes less obtrusive; when hymns, prayers and other forms are the congregation's not *his;* when the communion of saints takes the place of a hierarchy of saints.

While the worship and intercession of saints is rejected, the church must not be robbed of her heritage of saints. The apostle Paul reminds us (I Cor. 3:21-23), "All belongs to you: Paul, Apollos, Cephas, the world life, death, the present and the future—all belongs to you, and you belong to Christ, and Christ to God."

In the same way we possess the saints, though we cannot own them. The Sistine Madonna, the creations of Bach, *Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott,* and the myriad voices of the saints in song and psalm, St. John, St. Francis, John Huss, Martin Luther, John Calvin, John Wesley—all these are ours, all the noble army that "climbed the steep ascent to heaven through peril, toil and pain."

How suggestive it is, this thought of St. Paul, that we may sup-

40 Bishop Edwin D. Mouzon.

plement our own lives, enlarge and enrich them, by possessing the immortal part of every great life that has ever lived. Emerson apparently, had the same thought in mind when he wrote:

'I am the owner of the sphere,
Of the seven stars and the solar year,
Of Caesar's hand, and Plato's brain,
Of the Lord Christ's heart, and Shakespeare's strain.'

Suppose some man not content merely to contemplate the great moments of the past, should resolve to identify himself with the men who made those moments great; saying: 'all that was great in them shall live again in me. Such choices as they made, I, too, will make. Such courage as they showed, I, too, will show. Their spirit shall be my spirit, their devotion my devotion.' In that case, with how much truth it might be said that the noble past belongs to him and that by its possession his own life has been enlarged and enriched.[41]

That is an orthodox Protestant way of honoring the saints.

Will we live up to our creed and possess the saints? It cannot be done mechanically, nor by a sort of painless transfusion. As they possessed their day and generation, only so can we conquer ours. We must relive their faith and loyalty, even as and while we live our own God-given life. Some one has well said that the sixteenth century belongs to Luther and not to his holiness the Pope. In this we are taught how to possess our day. While we are concerned about possessing the saints, we should be much more concerned to possess the faith and the life that produced the saints. When we fully understand that we belong to Christ, and Christ to God, then will be fulfilled the "all belongs to you."

Those in harmony with the Divine symphony of salvation belong to humanity. Such saints belong to those who love them most and understand them best. Such become the inalienable possession of an appreciative humanity. And all these belong to Christ, and Christ to God.

41 Bishop Ernest F. Tittle, "The World Is Yours."

EQUIPMENT FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

EARL F. RAHN
ROCHESTER, N. Y.

As the varied functions of the church, from time to time, gain the ascendency in our thinking and action they definitely influence the type of structure and equipment that are essential to the working out of those functions. When the early Christians found in their church a place of refuge from the world, a place where kindred spirits might congregate and commune with God and one another, the catacombs served well their purpose. As the church gained strength and became conscious of its message to the world, its material equipment for its life and work culminated in massive cathedrals with their towering spires that proclaimed to all the world that they were centers for the worship of God.

The cathedral has left its indelible impress upon our ecclesiastical architecture and its spirit is ever dominant in our temples of worship. But this age sees a new function added to the church, or rather an old function with a new emphasis; namely, the education of youth in religion. As we learn more of the possibilities that lie in this field of the church's work, as we come to a clearer realization of the methods by which results are most economically achieved, we feel the need for adequate facilities to properly promote this phase of the church's endeavor. While we fully recognize the great need for adequate buildings that are dedicated to the worship of God, we are equally cognizant of the fact that suitable buildings for educational activities are essential to the complete church. We have adequate precedent and experience by which we can profit in the erection of the former, but we must seek and learn and make our own contribution in the erection of the latter.

The church as we know it today has come to express our highest aspirations, and its very atmosphere instills in us the spirit of reverence and worship. The new ad-

junct to the church, the parish school must be so constructed that in its turn it will express its individual purpose in the same manner. In it must be the atmosphere of study and mental effort, that which will mark it as a place of serious endeavor.

Our best model for study in this respect is the modern secular school, with the many advances the last few years have seen in its development. The little red school house no longer answers the purpose of modern education. This is adequately proven by a short drive in any section of the country. The once familiar typical buildings are no longer in evidence or are slowly falling into ruin while handsome new edifices take their places. These structures are marked by dignity, simplicity, and adaptability. A program of Religious Education demands similar environment. If the child is to feel that study in this field is important, the building must reflect a serious and studious atmosphere that is comparable to the environment connected with study in the child's mind. If this is neglected the child feels that such study cannot be very serious.

The arrangement of such a structure must depend largely upon the amount of space that is at hand and the financial limits that are set. In general, there are three major groups to be considered. First, the younger children, then the young people, and finally the adults. These groups naturally subdivide themselves. The next general consideration must be a means to adapt the building to the work for weekly classes as well as the Sunday groups. Many sections of the building should be so planned as to be of use for both purposes. A third general consideration is accessibility to the church building. The parish school is not an isolated unit but should be very definitely a subsidiary of the church. The two should combine into one united whole, as they combine the two functions of the church, worship and teaching.

The ideal building provides separate assembly rooms where each department may conduct its worship service and smaller rooms where each class may have its indi-

vidual instruction. Best results will be obtained where it is possible to have these rooms so built. Many times space will not permit the carrying out of this scheme of rooms and then it is frequently possible to divide the assembly rooms into separate class rooms by means of folding doors, or other folding partition devices.

The modern church school with its individual departments and class rooms is as far removed from the old Sunday school in which all classes were grouped together as the old time one room school is removed from the modern school building with its specialized departments. The value of this has frequently been questioned but modern practice proves the advisability of following this plan. It is merely an amplification of the long practiced system of grading. It is just as important to separate the Seniors from the Intermediates as it is to separate the Primary department from the rest of the school. It is also just as necessary to have separate worship services for each department as to have separate instruction for each class within the department. If such a departmental system is followed there should also be a large assembly room where upon occasion it is possible to have the entire school meet as one group for special programs of interest to the school as a whole. Such an occasional meeting is valuable for the school and serves to remind the various departments that they are the units in a larger organization and do not exist to themselves.

The most important consideration in making such plans should be given to the youngest children. Their departments should be so located that the children may find them easily and that the parents may find the rooms convenient for the purpose of bringing the children to them. In addition to being most conveniently located these departments should be the lightest and most cheerful in the school. It is a most unusual building that can be so planned that the elements of light and cheerfulness will not vary and it is important that the best rooms be given to the younger children. They are the most susceptible to

their surroundings and they respond in a higher degree to their environment.

The Beginners' department should be a large room that will provide ample space for forming all the children in a circle for their class work. The conditions of the Kindergarten to which many of them are accustomed should be reproduced in so far as possible. All available space should be utilized in windows, and the floor should be of waxed linoleum or of similar material that can readily be kept spotlessly clean. This is essential, as it is difficult to keep children from sitting on the floor and they like to be grouped there about the teacher when listening to a story. Such a floor also is useful in the playing of games. The wall-space should be divided between a blackboard and a corkboard. The former serves as a means of expression for the children and is an excellent help for the teacher. The corkboard is invaluable for the placing of temporary pictures and for the display of any handwork the children may learn to do. In this department care should be exercised that the room will have ample shelf and closet space.

The room should be equipped with pictures of interest to children. The selection of pictures is most important as they do so much to give the room the atmosphere and spirit which will be instilled in the child's mind. Pictures are an effective means of expressing the objectives of the department and will serve to set apart the Church school room from the secular Kindergarten, while retaining the features of the latter that are of assistance in reaching the mind of the child and teaching him.

Chairs should be comfortable and sturdy, of the proper size for the children. The teacher in charge of the department should be consulted as to preference for rectangular or circular tables around which the children may work. Semicircular tables are often desired. If space is not large, folding tables will be of great value and can easily be removed when not in use. A newcomer's corner is of great value in this department. Such a corner may be fitted up with a small table and chair and per-

haps a small rocking chair. Here a new child can be happily occupied and be in a position to become accustomed to the new surroundings in which it is placed before taking an actual part in the group.

The principles governing the planning of the Primary department are much the same as those for the Beginners in regard to the room itself and to much of the equipment. The room should be light and cheerful and well supplied with pictures, blackboard and corkboard space, closet and shelf space. In this department it is advisable to divide the children into classes. This division usually falls along the lines of ages. In order that there may be the least possible distraction during the lesson period curtains should separate the classes. In all instances curtains and partitions are substitutes for individual rooms, but where rooms are impossible they greatly aid in the teaching of the lesson and the holding of attention.

The Junior department may well take on a more seriously studious air. An assembly room, from which a corridor leads to small individual class rooms furnishes an excellent arrangement for this department. By means of four small class rooms and a folding door by which the assembly room may be divided into two, six classes can be cared for. This provides for a class of boys and a class of girls for each of the three ages found in this group. If the classes are arranged in the assembly in the order in which they leave to reach their rooms there will be no confusion or disorder attendant upon such an arrangement. A department thus planned will be found most convenient for the purpose of teaching and quite compact as to the use of space.

Here again a generous amount of blackboard space is desirable in all the rooms. Corkboard would be needed only in the assembly room. Here it is valuable for exhibition purposes. Small size table-arm chairs, sturdily built, are valuable assets to this department. They lend an air of seriousness to the class rooms and are invaluable in the making of note books and similar projects in

the line of activities connected with the expressional side of the work in this group.

These three departments should be grouped together so that when a child is promoted there will be no abrupt transition to a strange part of the building. By the time he leaves the Junior department he will be so well acquainted with the building that to be removed to a different section of it will work no hardship but will rather be an attraction. The rooms as outlined above are equally serviceable for educational work on Sunday, weekday, and vacation periods.

If space permits, the Intermediates should be provided with like facilities. This often proves impossible because of the size of this department and the large amount of space that would be necessary. This problem and the problem of using the large assembly hall of a parish building on Sunday may be made to help solve one another. If any group of classes must use this room without separation from each other, if there is no large class that can make adequate use of it, the Intermediate department can be placed there less harmfully, perhaps, than any other. In a large room the classes can be arranged in circular groups and kept sufficiently far from each other that the teacher can hold their interest. Such an arrangement is possible but decidedly a compromise. It should only be used if absolutely necessary.

The departments for the Seniors and the Young People are most attractive to them if they are given the appearance of lecture rooms similar to high school class rooms. Space may be conserved in these departments by the use of folding doors or other adequate partitions. These will permit classes to take their places for the worship period and by closing the doors give them adequate privacy for the study of the lesson. Wherever possible, permanent partitions will be found more satisfactory and more economical. A room sufficiently large for an assembly of a hundred may be conveniently divided into four or six class rooms by this method. Blackboard space and tablet-arm chairs add greatly to these departments.

The adults of the congregation also have their place in an educational building. Adult classes can make good use of rooms that are used for social purposes during the week. Each class may have its own worship period or combine with one or more other classes for that part of the Sunday hour, but each class should have its individual room. Other necessary features of the building are a kitchen and several unassigned class rooms that will furnish opportunity for the development of new classes. One room in the vicinity of the Young People's department should be provided for the organization of a training class for prospective teachers. Such a group could be recruited from that department and while they continued to meet with their classes for the worship period they could withdraw to the other class room for their lesson.

These observations have been drawn from the experience of those who planned and constructed the parish building of the Church of the Reformation, Rochester, N. Y. A brief description of that building, erected at a cost of $175,000, may serve make these observations more concrete.

The building is a fire-proof structure throughout. The exterior is light colored brick to match the church. The framework is of steel, the floors concrete with a linoleum surface, the walls finished in a sand-float plaster finish. It is a three-story building, the first floor below ground level and on a level with the basement of the church; the second floor on a level with the rear exit of the church; and the third floor with the balcony of the church.

The lobby at the entrance is on the street level and can also be entered from the front of the church. To the left are the office of the pastor and the general office of the church. Turning to the left from the lobby in the rear of the office, a descent of four steps leads to the corridor of the first floor. This corridor leads to the reception room, the social room, the kitchen, and the assembly hall. All adult and social activities center on this floor. On this same level in the renovated basement of the church are found showers, a locker room, parlor, kitchenette, and

Boy Scout room. The assembly hall serves in various capacities as an auditorium, a gymnasium, a banquet hall, and on Sunday as the meeting place for the Intermediates. The reception room is used for general meetings and a ladies' Bible class. The social room is used for suppers preceding meetings and for two Bible classes of men.

The second floor is given over to the children's classes. The front of that floor is occupied by the Beginners' and Primary departments. The left side of the corridor opens into the Junior department. On the right side, adjacent to the church and convenient for processional purposes is the choir room.

The departments for the Seniors and Young People are on the third floor. Here are also several additional class rooms of varying size. An apartment for the sexton occupies a portion of this floor.

Throughout the building windows are large and numerous. Skylights are used on the third floor, over the stair well, and in the assembly hall. Ventilation is obtained by manipulation of windows except in the assembly hall. Here a system of univents has been installed to insure an adequate supply of fresh air. A cloak room has been supplied on the first floor and the various departments have been provided with closets for the teachers' wraps and hooks in corridor space for the children.

In planning educational buildings these are some of the lines along which we must work. Pastors and educators, laymen, and architects, all must bend their energies to the solution. Continued application of studied theory to practical problems and individual situations of the Church school will lead to a fitting and proper expression in an efficient manner of the teaching function of the church.

THE ELEMENTARY-SCHOOL ORDINANCE FROM THE WUERTTEMBERG CHURCH CODE OF 1559

Translated by
ELBERT VAUGHAN WILLS
BROOKLYN, N. Y.

OF GERMAN SCHOOLS[1]

In order that the youth in our German schools may be well instructed and trained in the fear of God, sound doctrine, and good conduct, and that there may be uniformity in these matters, we have instituted the following ordi-

1 Translator's Note. The occurrence, during the year 1929, of the quadricentennial anniversary of the publication of Luther's Short Catechism quickens interest in the nature and the development of the vernacular elementary school of the Reformation period, and in the place which catechetical instruction and the use of catechetical material in the teaching of reading occupied in its curriculum. These factors may be most clearly understood, and their importance most adequately grasped, through the consideration of the detailed provisions for the presentation of, and drill upon, the subject-matter of religious instruction which are contained in the elementary-school ordinance embodied in the Württemberg Church Code of 1559. This school ordinance, moreover, was an epoch-making document in that it marked the earliest instance of the adoption by a German State of a coördinated State educational system including all grades from the elementary school to the university, and further because of its wide influence upon subsequent educational development through its use as a model by other States.

As early as the thirteenth century, the cathedral, canonicate, foundation, and cloister Latin schools of the Middle Ages proved inadequate to meet the needs of the German commercial cities, and city Latin schools came into being. Later, vernacular schools grew up in many of these cities. With the growth of paper manufacture, and particularly after the invention of printing, the number of such schools increased to meet the growing needs of the townsfolk. These schools taught reading, reading and writing, or reading, writing, and arithmetic. They were conducted by adventure teachers, and usually met with determined opposition from the ecclesiastical authorities of the cities. Often compacts were arranged whereby a limited number of teachers were licensed by the ecclesiastical authorities and authorized by the city councils. It appears, however, that unauthorized or hedge-schools (*Winkelschulen*) persisted. Vernacular teaching was a private affair, and the number of such schools was determined by demand and supply. To some extent, vernacular departments were subjoined to Latin

nance. In such affairs we command that this ordinance be observed.

schools. Religious training was imparted during the Middle Ages in the parochial schools, where the children were taught the Lord's Prayer, the Ave Maria, the Rosary, the Ten Commandments, and the Creed. Only in exceptional instances, however, does it appear that instruction in the rudiments of reading and writing was given in these schools. (Cf. Friedrich Heman: *Geschichte der neueren Pädagogik*, 4te Auflage (Osterwieck/Harz und Leipzig, 1913), p. 73. Religious instruction in the vernacular received an impetus through the work of the Brethren of the Common Life (Cf. Albert Hyma: *The Christian Renaissance* (New York, 1925), pp. 127-135.

Dr. Eugen Schmid, in a monograph entitled "Das württembergische Volksschulwesen im 16. Jahrhundert," in *Beihefte zu den Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für deutsche Erziehungs- und Schulgeschichte*, Bd. 11, pp. 89-144 (Berlin, 1906), has shown that at the beginning of the sixteenth century there were in the duchy of Württemberg nineteen city schools and that these were devoted mainly to Latin instruction. The first code establishing the Reformation in Württemberg was issued in 1536, following the restoration of Duke Ulrich. This was superseded by Duke Christopher's code of 1553, and the latter, in turn, by the code of 1559. Before promulgating this code, according to Schmid (pp. 97-98), the Duke obtained reports concerning conditions in the schools throughout his duchy. These enumerated 194 schools. Of this number 38 gave instruction in both Latin and German, and 156 exclusively in German, the great majority of the latter group being in the villages. The school ordinance of 1559, therefore, did not create a school system outright, but gave legal status and a broader basis for advancement to schools which had grown up during the preceding half-century. These figures, at least for Württemberg, stand in refutation of the often-repeated criticism that little attention was paid to vernacular education during the earlier part of the Reformation period. "Thus," says Schmid (p. 98), "there cannot be denied to the first generation of the Reformation period the glory of having done its part for the enlightenment of the people by means of German schools."

In addition to the elementary schools, and the writing and reckoning schools in certain cities, the ordinance provided for Latin schools in the cities and larger villages, for the maintenance of cloister schools (lower and higher) which had been founded in 1556 by Duke Christopher for the training of candidates for recruiting the ranks of the clergy, and for secondary schools in several cities. At the head of the educational system of the duchy stood the University of Tübingen. For theological students, a foundation furnishing maintenance throughout the university course, which had been established in 1548, was continued. The basis of the catechetical instruction required by the ordinance was a revision of the Catechism prepared by Johann Brenz and included in its original form in the Württemberg Church Code of 1536.

For a knowledge of the document here presented in translation, readers of English have depended upon the translation of Raumer's brief summary given in Barnard's *American Journal of Education*, Vol. VI (1859), pp. 426-434, and reprinted in Barnard's *Memoirs of Eminent Teachers and Educators with Contributions to*

OF THE SEPARATION OF PUPILS[2]

Inasmuch as some German schools are attended not only by boys but by girls as well, we direct that in such schools the children be separated, the boys being seated and taught in one group and the girls in another.

And under no circumstances shall the schoolmaster permit them to wander about or to slip away (*zusammenzuschlüpfen*) the one with the other, or allow disorderly intimacy among them.

OF INSTRUCTION

In order that the schoolmaster may properly instruct his pupils, he shall divide them into three groups:

One in which are placed those beginning to learn the alphabet;

A second for those beginning to syllabify;

the History of Education in Germany (Hartford, Conn., 1878), pp. 287-293. An abridgment of this summary is included by Cubberley in his *Readings in the History of Education* (Boston, 1920), pp. 249-251.

The Württemberg Church Code of 1559 in its entirety comprises a volume of 265 folios. It is entitled *Von Gottes Gnaden unser Christoffs Hertzogen zu Würtemberg und zu Teckh, Grauen zu Mümpelgart, &c. Summarischer und einfältiger Begriff, wie es mit der Lehre und Ceremonien in den Kirchen unsers Fürstenthumbs, auch derselben Kirchen anhangenden Sachen und Verrichtungen, bissher geübt unnd gebraucht, auch fürohin mit verleihung Gottlicher gnaden gehalten und volzogen solle* (Tüwingen, 1559). The copy used by the translator is in the library of the Union Theological Seminary, New York. An abridgment of this code (omitting the school ordinance) appears in A. L. Richter's *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts* (2 Bde., Weimar, 1846), Bd. II, pp. 198-222. The school ordinance is included in Reinhold Vormbaum's *Die evangelischen Schulordnungen des 16.-18. Jahrhunderts* (3 Bde., Gütersloh, 1860-1864), Bd. I, pp. 68-165.

The educational provisions of the Württemberg Church Code of 1559 were substantially influenced by Johann Brenz, if not actually prepared by him. The Württemberg elementary-school ordinance formed the basis of the corresponding section included in the Saxon Church Code of 1580. The text of the latter, as given by Albert Richter in his *Kursächsische Volksschulordnungen* (Leipzig, 1891), pp. 22-28, has been compared with that of the Württemberg document in the preparation of this translation, and the significant differences have been indicated by footnotes.

2 This item does not appear in the Saxon code of 1580. Cf. Albert Richter, *Kursächsische Volksschulordnungen*, p. 22.

A third for those beginning to read and write.

Likewise in each group he shall form separate divisions, so that those closely similar may be placed together, that the children may be thereby incited to diligence and the work of the schoolmasters lightened.

The schoolmasters also shall not hurry the children or observe their work continuously, for they have control of each one, so that what is appointed for them according to this ordinance may be thoroughly and properly learned.

They shall also be diligent in seeing to it that the children learn from the beginning to recognize the letters correctly. For this purpose then they shall occasionally break the order of the alphabet, and, disregarding the others, shall arrange some of the letters differently and ask the child to name them.

They shall drill them on letters of similar form, shall question them concerning the names of these letters, and require that they point them out in the alphabet.[3]

And they shall thereby insure that the pupils shall always correctly name the letters, that they enunciate the syllables distinctly, and finally that they pronounce the words syllable by sylllable, distinguishably and intelligently and without mumbling the final syllables.

As soon as the child can read tolerably well, they shall instruct him in writing, preparing copies in a suitable booklet, so that he may use them as models and may apply himself to the making of good German letters.

To this end they shall require the children to have suitable booklets for their writing. These they shall examine diligently, and shall discreetly correct any faults in the form, joining, or combination of the letters, or the like, which they may have found. They shall criticize each in a kindly manner, shall point out how he may improve himself in writing, and shall occasionally guide his hand.

And because the children should be inclined above all things to the fear of God, we also hereby decree that the schoolmasters shall not permit any child to use in his

3 This sentence does not appear in the Saxon code of 1580. Cf. Albert Richter, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

learning any scandalous, vicious, sectarian books, or otherwise unprofitable fables, but shall take care that where they would have used forbidden books, they shall learn from Christian books, such as the Catechism, the Psalm-Book, the Proverbs of Solomon, Jesus Sirach, the New Testament, and the like.

But especially it is our purpose that the Catechism, as contained in our church code, be employed, to the end that a like form may be held in memory by the children and that they may become habituated to it, so that they may learn it, practice upon it, and rightly understand and comprehend it.[4] For this purpose the schoolmasters shall set aside a certain day and hour in the week to drill upon and practice the Catechism with them. They shall also instruct them in a simple manner and explain it to them clearly.

Likewise they shall pit against each other the children in the school, always in pairs, boy against boy, girl against girl.[5] The questions and answers of the Catechism shall be passed between them and they shall be allowed to recite, so that they may become accustomed to repeating it publicly in the church, in the presence of the congregation, at the catechetical period.

They shall also instruct and practice with the boys on certain days and hours in the week, to accustom them to the hymns of the church.

And on several days of the week, as there may be opportunity, at a stated time, they shall present to them, section by section, the German menology (*Cision*), and shall instruct them therein.[6]

4 The Saxon code of 1580 specifies the use of Luther's Catechism. Cf. Albert Richter, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

5 In the Saxon code of 1580, this sentence reads as follows: "Likewise they shall pit against each other the children in the schools, always in pairs, according as they equal each other in their knowledge of the Catechism."

6 This sentence does not appear in the Saxon code of 1580. Similar calendars in Latin verse, usually hexameter, were used in Latin schools. Cf. art. "Cisio-Janus" in Meyer's *Konversations-Lexicon.*

DISCIPLINE

The schoolmasters shall not allow or tolerate in their pupils blasphemy or base, frivolous discourse, much less annoying matters or acts.

They shall also observe the regulation concerning the children, providing that, at the time when the Catechism is to be studied in the church, before assembling there, all shall gather in a body at the school and be led by the schoolmaster to the church. Hence also he shall require that they remain within the church and listen attentively.

To this end he shall always designate some pair who shall recite the Catechism in the church.

Likewise he shall admonish them to pay strict attention to the exposition of the Catechism, so that they may be able thereafter to relate something of it to him.

Then after the close of the sermon, he shall question and examine them thereon.

Moreover, the schoolmasters, with the boys, shall render the hymns of the church in such measure as may be prescribed for each school.

And before noon, preceding the intermission when they are to go home for dinner, they shall hold prayer with them, and especially they shall have them repeat and narrate the most familiar portions of the Christian belief, the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments.

They shall not permit the pupils under any circumstances to wander hither and thither in the school, or to go home without permission, but shall cause them to come to each lesson at the proper time and remain until the general dismissal, and to sit quietly over their Catechism-tables or booklets.[7]

Hence they shall not permit them to make any commotion or outcry, but shall hold them in restraint.

7 The "Katechismustafel" was a placard upon which were printed the Catechism, the alphabet, and sometimes additional matter, such as the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, sacramental formularies for baptism and the Lord's Supper and a precept for distinguishing vowels from consonants. (Cf. Schmid, *op. cit.*, pp. 122-123).

And after the dismissal the pupils shall observe the regulations; therefore the schoolmaster shall appoint monitors (*Aufmerker*) from among their number, whereby he may ascertain that they go directly and quietly home and may not unwisely relax discipline.

So also he shall admonish them earnestly to be peaceable and well-disposed toward each other, and to refrain from all mockery, abuse, and ill-will against one another. He shall punish those disregarding their duty.

Likewise, he shall not allow to go unpunished one who may take anything from another or destroy or damage anything belonging to another.

And in every way possible he shall exercise diligence that they keep and show themselves God-fearing, modest, honest, peaceable, sociable, and devout.

While it shall be proper for the schoolmasters to use the rod in correction, they shall not rail at the children, seize them by the hair, strike them about the head, become enraged at them (*Tolle geben*), or the like; but in their punishments they shall observe the proper bounds for reforming the children without frightening them away from the school.

It shall also be the duty of the schoolmasters, according to the Catechism, to practice, in the church in summer, in the schoolroom in winter, the Catechism and common hymns with the other youth in the hamlets who are not their pupils, and to instruct them diligently therein, as they are assigned at all times by the pastors, and as they may be commanded.[8]

When the office of sacristan is connected with the German school, we decree that the schoolmasters, as well as other sacristans, go with the pastors when they are to administer the last sacrament to the sick to bear the chalice and attend to similar duties.

In order that the schoolmasters may the more industriously devote their attention to the school, beadle and military service, in those places where they have heretofore

8 The remainder of this division does not appear in the Saxon code of 1580.

been appllied to the office of sacristan, shall hereafter be separated therefrom where sacristan service and school service are combined. Where, however, communities require beadle or military service, they may obtain other persons for this purpose at the expense of the entire town.

HOW AND BY WHOM THE GERMAN SCHOOLMASTERS SHALL BE APPOINTED AND EXAMINED

As the towns of our principality have generally introduced the German schools, we direct that they be allowed such schools, and that this, their long-standing privilege, be not withdrawn.

Accordingly when vacancies occur in the future in any German schools, they shall exert themselves zealously to obtain another schoolmaster. Nevertheless, they shall themselves in no wise establish him in the school, but shall present him before our designated church-councillors.

It shall be incumbent upon these to examine each one so presented to them and to ascertain whether he wishes to be appointed to the school to be supplied, and whether or not he may be entrusted with the improvement and welfare of the pupils.

And they shall confirm no one unless he first shall set before them his adequate knowledge and testimony concerning his nativity and his upright life and conduct:

That in matters of religion he is not unorthodox, sectarian, or superstitious, but of the pure, true, Christian faith according to the Augsburg Confession and that of our own code.

That he understands the Catechism and knows how to impart it intelligibly to the youth, and to instruct them simply in it.

That he has good understanding and is prepared to teach the children soberly and profitably in the alphabet, spelling, reading, and reckoning (*Rechnen*).

And besides that he writes a neat and legible hand and can advantageously impart it to the children.

Our church-councillors, by virtue of the commissions which they hold, shall examine each one, and if they find

no fault in him, they shall forthwith approve him and permit him to be appointed.

In case the schools in one or more towns become vacant, and our subjects know no teachers to be appointed, our church-councillors may, where they find a worthy one as described, refer him to the authorities (*Gerichten*), whose duty it shall be to appoint him to the vacant position and to allow him the customary emoluments thereof.[9]

Our church-councillors are likewise charged by us at all times with the added commission of insuring that the schools shall be provided with the necessary stipends and the schoolmasters with their support, inasmuch as the welfare of their State will be thus promoted.

Concerning the school-fees (*Schulgelt*) we direct that the following distinction be made, to wit:

Where the German schools are appended to the Latin schools, they shall be governed by our foregoing regulations concerning particular schools, namely, that a boy who studies Latin shall pay as tuition not more than four *Kreutzer*, but one who studies German will pay five *Schillinge* each quarter at ember-days (*Fronfasten*).

Where, however, there are only German schools, as in the small villages and hamlets, there the customary fees shall be continued as heretofore without increase.

Besides, we wish our church-councillors at all times upon opportunity to give advice concerning those things that promote or hinder, and further to observe this decree. Likewise they shall everywhere take steps to insure that their stipends and fees shall be provided justly and beneficially for the schoolmasters.

WHEREOF EACH MASTER OF A GERMAN SCHOOL NOT CONNECTED WITH A LATIN SCHOOL SHALL PROMISE AND PLEDGE HIMSELF

First, that he will at all times zealously and to the best of his ability keep in remembrance and inform himself concerning this, our code, and his office, as to what he should do or refrain from doing under all conditions.

9 The remainder of this division does not appear in the Saxon code of 1580.

And besides, that he will, by the grace of God, govern the school assigned to him and the pupils committed to his charge with all true industry, and that he will set the youth an example of a modest, decorous, and temperate life.

That he will not be absent from the school at any hour haphazardly or without sufficient reasons; but that he will be in the school at the proper time and will discharge with diligence, by instruction and in other ways, each duty which this code imposes upon him.

That in punishment he will refrain from excess or anger, but will keep the children at their studies and maintain discipline with moderation and as the code provides.

To present the Catechism, the hymns, and the (Lord's) Prayer to the youth with faithfulness and diligence, to practice with them, and to instruct them therein.

That likewise, by virtue of his official duty, he will be attentive and obedient to his designated superintendent, pastor, bailiff (*Amptman*), and court (*Gericht*), as a loyal servant; that he will advance our interests and those of the village, as well as the good of the schools with all diligence; and that to the extent of his power he will warn against and avert harm and injury.

And that if, during the period of his service, there should arise any difference between him and our subjects or associates, which may be decided by us, he will give and accept justice, and will content himself with the law in effect in our principality, without further appeal.[10]

Likewise that he will not journey away from the school or leave it permanently without permission from the court and the superintendent.

That should he desire to resign his office, he will make known his intention a quarter-year in advance, so that another may be secured within that time.

That he will not leave until he has paid our subjects

10 This item does not appear in the Saxon code of 1580. Cf. Albert Richter, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

whatever he may owe them, or given other satisfactory assurances and evinced his intention to pay.[11]

And that in every respect he will abide by and carry out the code and the instructions given him on our behalf by the superintendent and the pastor.

Whereof he shall subscribe with his own hand, before the bailiff and in the presence of the pastor and the court, to a promise and pledge to observe and perform all these things faithfully and helpfully.

So far as concerns the schoolmasters who also teach Latin, we direct that the obligation be the same.[12]

OF THE SUPERINTENDENCE OF THE GERMAN SCHOOLS

In order that the schoolmasters may teach German not according to their own plan but that all things may be done according to our code, and the welfare of the poor youth alone considered, we hereby decree that in those German schools which are connected with Latin schools, the inspection be arranged by the local particular schools, through designated persons, not alone as to the performance of the Latin school, but also at the same time to determine that of the German school. The deputies shall conform to this code and shall note carefully what is observed and performed by the teachers. Where, however, only German is taught and studied, the pastors shall serve as superintendents for their several localities. Weekly or fortnightly, unexpectedly, yet at a convenient time, the pastor shall visit the school to observe and give attention to the manner in which the schoolmaster conducts himself in instruction and discipline, and to examine some of the pupils in the Catechism, the alphabet, spelling, reading, and writing, to the end that he may ascertain whether the schoolmaster is industrious and what he is accomplishing by way of results among the children.

He shall likewise take note in the church, from the

11 This item was omitted from the Saxon code of 1580. Cf. Albert Richter, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

12 This item, in common with other references to vernacular departments in Latin schools, does not appear in the Saxon code of 1580. Cf. Albert Richter, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

singing and the Catechism, whether the schoolmaster has industriously instructed the children therein, and whatever fault or defect he may find he shall in each case endeavor to remove. Where this is not brought about forthwith, he shall point it out or place it in writing before our special visitors at the time of their visitation, with all pertinent circumstances, so that it may be brought before our superintendents and proper investigation ultimately conducted[13] in the manner prescribed by us.

OF GERMAN WRITING AND RECKONING SCHOLARS

Because among the cities and city scriveners of our duchy there is no small lack of good clerks and reckoners, and inasmuch as our own advantage, the general welfare, and wise administration will be promoted thereby, we direct and decree that there shall be selected by our designated councillors three pious, Christian, zealous, German schoolmasters, who shall be good penmen and scribes, qualified to teach reckoning both with the pen and with the rule, and shall be industrious. One of these shall be assigned to Stuttgart, one to Tübingen, and the third to Urach. In these places they shall govern in orderly fashion the schools assigned to their charge. And in order that there may be secured men having greater skill, and that they may be retained, we direct that they be allowed each year a grant from the general church-treasury (*Kirchenkasten*), in addition to the stipulated tuition, and further that places of domicile be furnished them in these cities.

13 The section on vernacular elementary schools in the Saxon code of 1580 is brought to a conclusion at this point, omitting provision for German writing and reckoning schools. Cf. Albert Richter, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT

Jeremiah: His Time and His Work. By Adam C. Welch, D.D. Oxford University Press. London: Humphrey Milford, 1929. viii + 263 pages.

It is interesting to pick up a book by Professor Welch. We are assured of independent thinking and untrammeled conclusions. Four years ago Professor Welch gave us his *Code of Deuteronomy*, in which he argued for the theory that the book is the code of a northern shrine, that—except in ch. 12:1-7—there is no demand for centralization of worship and that the issue in the original Deuteronomy is not "Einheit" but "Reinheit." Equally independent and arresting is his *Jeremiah*. He approaches his study with no presupposition except that Jeremiah was an honest soul and "as reasonably consistent as human nature can be." According to Prof. Welch, too much emphasis has been laid upon "the weeping prophet." "There is no more constant or fearless fighter in the roll of Israel's heroes of the faith." He was provocative and aggressive. He bitterly assailed the political alliances of his day. In fact, Prof. Welch finds more political intrigue in the reformation of Josiah than religious zeal. For a century Judah had had its eye on the remnant of Israel. As long as Assyria was able to send armies to the west no amalgamation could be attempted. But now Assyria was crumbling to pieces, Egypt was stirring and Necho was on the march. It was a propitious hour for Josiah to attempt what his predecessors had failed to do. The recovery of Deuteronomy suggested his course;his reform should first be religious, and political unity would follow.

Prof. Welch finds the only satisfactory explanation of Josiah's untimely death, not what the Chronicler gives us—for no sane person of Josiah's slender resources could hope to stop the great Egyptian—but Necho's discovery that he was about to organize the whole land from Dan to Beersheba in a religious centralization. Josiah might prove inconvenient; he must be put out of the way.

With the death of Josiah the political program collapsed, but the movement he had inaugurated had another side. It brought in centralization of worship, which meant the development of a powerful priesthood which inevitably laid the emphasis on conformity. To oppose this new and popular movement meant to be at odds with "courtiers, priests, most of the prophets, and finally the populace," but that is just what Jeremiah did. The movement ran counter to the fundamental principles of the Jewish faith. It locked up Yahweh in a temple cult which localized him and limited him to an

artificial system. It was at that that Jeremiah struck, like Luther in a later day. He was not a temperate reformer; few reformers are. "His denunciation of the temple came perilously near making it a religious duty to do without any such help to worship." But there was something that Israel needed more than a temple—it was the *mishpat* of the Mosaic covenant. Jeremiah was the father of personalism in religion and the spiritual founder of the synagogue, that great democratic institution built on the work of the prophets. He saw the far horizons of spiritual religion, and thus he was the greatest of the prophets.

These are some of the things Prof. Welch helps us to see. It requires some editing of the present text of Jeremiah, which has been rewritten in the interest of ecclesiastical Judaism, but it preserves the continuity of the prophetic message. Prof. Welch has given us the most searching and original study of Jeremiah that we possess. A new Jeremiah looks out upon us from these pages. It is an interesting coincidence that it laid the foundations for, as it antedated, Dr. Charles Jefferson's *Cardinal Ideas of Jeremiah*. These two notable books have added much to our equipment for Jeremianic exposition.

H. C. ALLEMAN

The Abingdon Bible Commentary. Edited by Frederick Carl Eiselen, Edwin Lewis and David C. Downey. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1929. xvi + 1452 pages. $5.00.

When, in reviewing Bishop Gore's *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture* (cf. The Lutheran Church Quarterly, Jan. 1929, pp. 122-3), we said: "If one were to ask, Which (Bishop Gore's or Prof. Peake's) shall we buy? our answer would be, Both—or neither," we had no "advance information" that another challenger —and that an American—was so soon to enter the field. But here it is, with its sixty-six contributors and its almost 1500 pages of choice material. We knew that the Abingdon Press was at work on a commentary, but so well were its plans guarded that inquiries failed to secure any information as to the nature or magnitude of the work.

It is but fair to say, that, while the result is a *magnum opus*, it is not strictly an American product, nor was that the thought of the editors. "The ripest and most reverent scholarship of the English-speaking world" has been sought. "The United States, Canada, England, Scotland, Wales, Australia and India have been laid under tribute." Nor is this a Methodist commentary. Among the contributors are men of the Church of England, the American Episcopal Church, and the United Church of Canada, Wesleyans, Congregationalists, Baptists, Quakers, Presbyterians, Primitive Methodists

and Disciples. The Commentary thus becomes an interesting experiment in the field of interdenominationalism.

With such a diversity of contributors, the Commentary lacks the homogeneity of Bishop Gore's book. There is considerable overlapping and the writers frequently do not agree. E. g., of Isa. 7:14, Prof. J. E. McFadyen says, " 'Immanuel' means 'God is with us,' and the giving of the name is a confession of his mother's faith that God is manifesting himself in the history of her people"; while Prof. Rogers says, "Who was this mysterious Immanuel? The present writer believes that he was the personal Messiah, and here is his first appearance in prophecy." Of the Psalter Prof. H. W. Robinson says, "The book of Psalms is in form primarily a collection of liturgies...its piety largely clusters around the ritual of the Temple"; while Prof. Eiselen says, "The Psalms contain in the form of sacred lyrics the outpourings of devout souls who came into the very presence of God, held communion with him and were privileged to hear the sweet sound of his voice."

It is evident that the editors were not guided by any norm of interpretation of the Old Testament. The writers were untrammeled. It is notable that both views of a disputed question usually are stated. The Wellhausen theory is reflected by most of the writers on the Old Testament, though certainly not by Welch. But, with all its latitude, the book is well balanced, with 70 pages of General Introduction, 746 on the Old Testament and 559 on the New Testament. While lacking nothing in scholarship it is withal a popular commentary, marked throughout by simplicity of style. It is an up-to-date commentary; its archaeology includes the excavations at Beisan and Ur. The material has been well edited by Prof. Lewis, its system of cross references making it available at every point. Lastly, the Commentary has a very complete index and a series of maps.

The articles on the Bible as a whole are notable. How To Study the Bible, by Prof. Rae, is deserving of its first place. Prof. Tillett contributes a searching article on The Divine Element in the Bible, while Bishop McConnell contributes an equally valuable article on The Christian Approach to the Study of the Scriptures. The articles on the Old Testament represent the best English scholarship. The younger Driver has prepared the article on The Formation of the Old Testament; Prof. T. H. Robinson, The History of the Hebrew and Jewish People, and Genesis; Prof. H. Wheeler Robinson, The Religion of Israel, Hosea and Amos; Prof. J. E. McFadyen, Israel's Messianic Hope, Micah, Habakkuk, Haggai, and Zechariah; Prof. Lofthouse, Job; Prof. Rogers, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Isaiah; Prof. Welch, Jeremiah; Prof. Wardle, Ezekiel; Prof. Oesterly, Judges. While we cannot endorse all of the interpretations herein presented, it is a pleasure to say that Prof. Rogers' exposition is particularly satisfying in its emphasis of Isaiah's

evangelical message and Prof. Welch's Jeremiah is a very full outline of his notable Oxford University Press volume, in which a new Jeremiah stands before the reader.—H. C. Alleman.

The special articles on the New Testament are: The Historical and Religious Background of the Early Christian Movement (George Herbert Box); The Formation of the New Testament (James Moffatt); The Transmission of the New Testament (A. T. Robertson); The Structure of the Synoptic Gospels (Ernest Ward Burch); The Chronology of the New Testament (Ismar J. Peritz); The Language of the New Testament (Henry J. Cadbury); The New Testament and Criticism (E. F. Scott); The Life of Jesus Christ (Harris Franklin Rall); The Parables of Jesus (Herbert G. Wood); The Miracles of the New Testament (Edwin Lewis); The Life and Work of Paul (J. Vernon Bartlett); The New Testament and Christian Doctrine (Edwin Lewis).

The commentaries have been written as follows: Matthew and Mark, J. Newton Davies; Luke, J. Alexander Findlay; John, Alfred E. Garvie; Acts, Ernest Ward Burch; Romans, C. Anderson Scott; First and Second Corinthians, Wilbert F. Howard; Galatians, John Dow; Ephesians, Colossians and Philemon, Charles H. Dodd; Philippians, James Alex. Robertson; First and Second Thessalonians, Chester C. McCown; First and Second Timothy and Titus, William J. Lowstuter; Hebrews, Herbert T. Andrews; James, Edward H. Sugden; First Peter, Benjamin W. Robinson; Second Peter and Jude, Shirley Jackson Case; First, Second and Third John, Burton Scott Easton; Revelation, F. Bertram Clogg.

A glance at this list of contributors is sufficient to show the variety of scholarly opinion represented. That men of such divergent points of view are brought to collaborate on a project of this nature is significant of the progress that has been made from denominational and dogmatic limitations towards a more tolerant objective approach to the problems of biblical interpretation.

Reading the "Foreword" by Dr. Downey and the "Explanations" by Prof. Lewis, however, awakens certain misgivings which are not altogether unsustained by a study of the New Testament section of the Commentary itself. "Within the limits of the distinctive emphases of historical Christianity," says Dr. Downey, "the scholars who have contributed to the making of this COMMENTARY have been allowed full freedom of expression" (p. iii). "In arranging with the contributors," says Prof. Lewis, the editors reserved the right of making such revision of manuscripts as seemed necessary to secure the aims of the COMMENTARY. For the most part, this revision has been confined to eliminations, additions, recasting sentences, harmonizing or calling attention to differences, and rearranging material. Where in a given case anythng more serious than this was required, the changes were made in consul-

tation with the contributor" (p. xv). One could wish that more specific information had been given here.

"The distinctive emphases of historical Christianity" needs interpretation. Did the editors supply the definition? And did the conception of "distinctive emphases" affect the assignment of parts to the various contributors? Anyone who compares the publications of some of these contributors dealing with subjects on which they have not written for the Commentary will find himself at once trying to visualize the Commentary written by the same contributors, but with a different distribution of parts and with complete freedom. The "nihil obstat" of the Catholic, the "Apostolic Succession" of the Anglican, and "the distinctive emphases" of the Abingdon Commentary—when shall we have a commentary which aims to get at the truth of things regardless of their apologetic bearing, one which recognizes that to be really successful in winning this present age, an apologetic must be a by-product of an objective search for truth rather than a constant conscious end in itself?

The Abingdon Commentary is nevertheless a step in this direction. The apologetic method, with all its limitations, may be of great value. M. Goguel in reviewing the *Jésus-Christ, sa personne, son message, ses preuves* (Paris, 1928), of the Jesuit, de Grandmaison, describes it thus: "A work of apologetics, that is to say, a defense of a position fixed in advance, and not an investigation undertaken with entire intellectual freedom and with the sole purpose of getting at the testimony of the documents. Not a search for the truth, whatever it may be, but a counsel's plea in defense of a truth already possessed. Nevertheless, historians who would be historians only, that is, who are seeking not arguments but light from the texts, would be wrong in neglecting the *Jésus-Christ* of Father de Grandmaison. In it they will find pointed out errors of method, or of application of method, committed by certain critics, which they will be careful to avoid. The Father's objections, even when they do not appear to be sustained, will lead them to revise their work rigidly, and thus the learned Jesuit, somewhat in spite of himself, will aid the critics whom he opposes, in an examination of their knowledge, from which their theories will emerge, improved perhaps in some points, but in any case strengthened" (cf. Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, Jan.-Feb. 1929, p. 67).

Moreover, the great body of material in the Commentary to which the foregoing criticism does not apply will certainly be a great help to "those who are interested in this vital problem of strengthening the appeal of the Christian religion by making clearer and more intelligible its essential message concerning God and man" (p. iii). The words of Prof. Vergilius Ferm with reference to the Commentary edited by Bishop Gore are eminently true also of the Abingdon Bible Commentary: "In a day when so many

men are succumbing to a cheap and superficial Bible study, consisting either of a random perusal of translations with little or no regard for historical context or appreciation of the problems of linguistics, or of an artificially constructed "outline" pasting passages together in some imagined framework more satisfying to an imaginative exegete than to a critical exegete, with no regard for the problems of textual interpolations, additions, peculiarities of style, environmental colorings, etc., this volume is a real antidote. Those who especially need the guidance of careful and reverent scholars are often the very ones who will pass by such a book as this—they are caught under the illusion of their own pet theory (short-cut method) of biblical interpretation or the erroneous belief that the Bible may adequately be understood merely by just reading it. There is a wealth of homiletical suggestions in this Commentary which will set many a modern preacher right, especially one who has succumbed to a Rotarian type of pulpit discourse which consists of telling a series of puerile stories culled from some cheap "Illustrations for Every Occasion" or from some long-out-of-date pulpit commentary."

Fortunate is he whose pocketbook does not compel him to choose between these two Commentaries. They will be found to supplement each other. Sunday schools would do well to put them into the hands of their teaching staffs by way of supplementing their denominational literature.

R. T. Stamm

Our Recovery of Jesus. By Walter E. Bundy. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1923. 359 pages. $2.50.

The attempt to get back of the creeds and cult of a "Christianized" church to the actual life and teaching of Jesus is no new thing. But Bundy, who is Professor of English Bible at De Pauw University, makes the venture from a somewhat novel approach. He seeks to discover the nature of Jesus' own religious experience and the inner elements of his personal piety. He is concerned with *'the religion of Jesus'* rather than *'the religion about Jesus'*; and he is eager to see the church enter into the secret of that religious experience and share it.

Bundy finds the key to Jesus' personal religion in his constant aspiration to learn and do the divine will. In social relationships, Jesus does not use detailed rules nor ready-made remedies, but constantly follows the principle: 'Be loyal to the will of God.' The supreme interest which Jesus sets at the center of all life is the kingdom of God; and he is so completely devoted to this cause,—the rule of God in human hearts,—that this very loyalty becomes the solution of all social questions, whether they be racial, political or economic. The personal problems of Jesus arise from his consecration to his cause, and, at the same time, are solved by his

unceasing devotion to it. Instances of Jesus' personal religious crises, cited by the author, are: His decision to preach the kingdom rather than call attention to himself by miracles of healing; his subordination of the idea of his Messiahship; and the final submission to the will of God that leads him to his fate on the cross. These experiences must have involved profound spiritual struggles. Unlike Israel's prophets and Paul, Jesus had the help of no great initial vision and of no succeeding ecstasies. His piety was sustained through prayer and constant communion with God. His seven personal prayers are probably the best disclosure of Jesus' inner religious life.

In his earlier 'companion-study', *The Religion of Jesus*, which is a more comprehensive development of the same theme, the author forecasted the work under review. In the latter volume, Bundy seems to be gathering up the chips in his literary work-shop, in order to show how his thesis is constructed and on what basis it stands. At least half of the book deals with a literary and historical criticism of the sources used in the life-of-Jesus research. With characteristic alliteration, the author describes them as a mixture of fiction, faith and fact. The fiction he attributes to the natural accretion of the legendary. The faith of the early Christians, inspired by their assurance of the Resurrection of Jesus, colors the records. In the author's opinion, not only the Acts of the Apostles, the Pauline Epistles and the Gospel of John were thus "Christianized"; but the Synoptics,—even Mark with its reputation for historical reliabilty,—are all treatises to uphold the Christian faith. To recover Jesus, we must go back of the records; and Bundy thinks that he can adopt this method and still find a residuum of facts for a certain basis of his study of Jesus' religious experience.

To many this will seem a limited and unstable foundation. Even Bundy acknowledges that the facts of Jesus' life and the Christian faith are very closely implicated. Faith rests upon the antecedent facts which inspire it and give it color. To distinguish the two is hardly as easy as the author makes it. If the church of today can share in Jesus' religious experience, surely his first followers could also share it. One cannot help wishing for a discussion of Bundy's thesis by one of the great New Testament scholars who has a surer perspective of the facts of Jesus' experience.

Any psychological study of Jesus runs the risk of considering him as a merely human personality. Bundy's treatment is reverent, and his work is inspired by a confessed awakening ten years ago to the religious values of Jesus' piety for his own. The reader must judge, however, whether the author deserves such a tribute as Albert Schweitzer paid to another: "He left him (Jesus) still some greatness, something unexplained, and did not venture to

apply to everything the petty standards of inquisitive modern psychology" (*The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 309).

The language is clear and simple. The author's didactic habit of reiteration emphasizes his thought; and a kind of prophetic passion to prove his point frequently suggests homiletic applications.

Bundy's style and purpose may be illustrated by the following extracts from his opening chapter, "The Will to Recover Jesus": "Our chief task is to expose ourselves to the immeasurable religious values perfectly expressed in Jesus' life. In his experience we find that religion possesses a richness and reality that is amazing and infinite, which in turn demands of us an unrestrained religious response. We must take less interest in heresy and more interest in apostasy. A disciple is not to be judged by his special theory of the person of Christ.... Every follower of Jesus...must ask himself certain serious personal questions.... Does the religion of Jesus mean for me the elevation of my ethical ideals, the mobilization of my moral motives and powers, the leadership of my religious loyalties, the focal point of my religious feeling and faith, the kindling fire of my religious enthusiasm and devotion—in short, the polar and pivotal point of my personal piety?... In pulpit and in pew we need a faithful sharing of the religious experience of Jesus."

M. R. HAMSHER

Jesus on Social Institutions. By Shailer Mathews. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929. 158 pages. $1.50

An intelligent view of Jesus' era and his teaching is most satisfactorily obtained by a study of the social attitudes prevailing.

The approach to an understanding is through "social psychology," and "particularly through the messianic hope" of the Jewish people, "and the messianic hope is a phase of the psychology of revolution."

Western civilization was not military in this period of history. It was an era of peace and given to political and social advancement. Palestine was not an outpost of civilization, but was within the periphery of the political activity and progress of the Roman empire.

The Jew saw in the progressive city life of Palestine the policing soldier; in his freedom of worship in Jerusalem he felt the restraint of the Roman Temple-guard; for the maintenance of political and material advancement was a necessary tax imposed upon the populace, which was particularly obnoxious to the Jew. Deliverance from these galling restrictions and impositions felt by the Jewish population, despite the advantages of good government, lay through messianic leadership, and such a hope implied the revolutionary spirit.

After a study of political and social revolutions in general history Dr. Mathews studiously applies this conditioning psychology

to the creative period of thought-life and social action and attitude in the times and the teaching of Jesus.

Jesus was an "agitator," and chose for his group of companions men of the revolutionary spirit; but Jesus himself was no political revolutionist, and refused to utilize the crowd of followers for revolutionary organization. He carefully taught his disciples to avoid hatred and vindictiveness, and inculcated "sacrificial social-mindedness." The good will was to be the social attitude. He elevated love as the motivating principle in human conduct.

The careful reader of Jesus' Sermon on the Mount, who gives literal interpretation to the sayings of Jesus, may well doubt from the conduct of the followers of Jesus today, whether so-called Christians of our era are really Christian.

But Jesus did not legislate; he taught underlying abiding prinicples; he inculcated attitudes and framed no programs for social execution. It is a misinterpretation of Jesus' teaching to elevate epigrams into legislation. Jesus used the language of revolution, a revolution not insurrectionary, not political, but spiritual; his purpose was to sanctify the revolutionary spirit of his disciples.

Jesus was no ascetic, nor did he despise the humanities; material things were good in themselves, but not an end in themselves. Jesus' teaching was nonpolitical, and from the modern standpoint, noneconomic; his era was agricultural and individually commercial, but not modern industrial.

Jesus did not teach a philosophy, a system, nor a program, but fundamental attitudes of the soul.

Dr. Mathews exhibits these attitudes as taught by Jesus in relation to the Family, the State, and the Church. He gives a sane presentation of the relation of the church to present day social activities. The church may become "the manual-training school of social life rather than the exclusive agent of social service."

The book is most helpful to those who have an eye and an ear for the religious difficulties attending Gospel interpretation and application in our complex civilization. By a reshaping of spiritual attitudes, by a re-emphasis of the principle of love and good will as taught by Jesus, may come a happy control of economic and social life by Christian ideals.—M. COOVER.

The Divinity School of the University of Chicago has achieved a reputation for bringing into prominence certain currents of thought in connection with an interpretation and evaluation of religion, e. g., pragmatism, instrumentalism, naturalism, positivism, humanism, and lately, a historico-social emphasis which is attracting wide attention. Of all the trends mentioned, the latter is undoubtedly the most permanently significant and no doubt is making a real contribution to the understanding not only of religion as a whole but Christianity in particular.

Dean Shailer Mathews of this school has, for a number of years, been calling attention through his publications to a most neglected phase in the study of the origin and development of religion, viz., its setting in the framework of social environment and culture. Christianity, he maintains, cannot adequately be understood without an appreciation of the social atmosphere, the stresses and the strains, of the day which brought it forth. The New Testament, for example, is almost a closed book without an understanding of the social forces that affected its authors in the early stages of the Christian movement. Moreover, with this setting in mind, he seeks to interpret Christianity for the modern day, especially its social implications. This volume belongs together with such books as Shirley Jackson Case's *Jesus, A New Biography* and some of the suggestive essays which appear in the symposium *Religious Thought in the Last Quarter-Century,* all of which are expressions of this historico-social approach.

I have heard Christian ministers speak in a derogatory way about the "social gospel." Unquestionably that may be justifiable if by that expression is meant the conception of Christianity as *nothing but* a program of social ethics. Nevertheless, I find it difficult to conceive of Christianity apart from a social gospel, by which is meant the deep social implications of Jesus' teaching. (How, otherwise, may we understand such declarations as "Ye are the salt of the earth"; "Ye are the light of the world"; "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven?") Dean Mathews is vitally interested in calling out the wider implications of Jesus' message. In that he is unquestionably right. He is also convinced that to understand that message we must acquaint ourselves with the very social *milieu* out of which Christianity developed. In this he is also unquestionably right.

Personally, I am frank to say that altogether too little concern is paid by many to this approach and to such implications as are here pointed out. A good many of us need to read into this field to gain a fuller appreciation of our holy religion.

VERGILIUS FERM

The Literary Background of the New Testament. By George L. Hurst. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928. 163 pages. $1.50.

Jesus the Man and Christ the Spirit. By George Coulson Workman. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928. 343 pages. $2.50.

Here are two recent studies by clergymen of scholarly attain-

ments who are at home in the science of Biblical criticism. Both books are the products of years of critical study and represent the advanced position in recent research.

The first seeks to reveal the literature which lay to the hands of Jesus and the early disciples; the forms of literary style (such as wisdom sayings, poetry, parable, allegory, epistle, etc.) represented in the New Testament; and the influence either by quotation or by echo of non-canonical literature upon the sacred documents. The book, in short, seeks to answer the query: "What contemporary writings influenced the writers of the New Testament?" Obviously, a careful and critical reply would shed considerable light in the understanding of the New Testament books.

The second seeks to picture the historical Jesus and to interpret the Christ of experience, drawing the distinction between a visible and corporeal person which must submit to the limitations of the natural environment and the invisible and incorporeal spirit that rises above the boundaries of space and time. In treating Jesus the person the author brings to bear a most searching historicism; in interpreting the Christ he seeks to show how an evangelical position is in entire harmony with whatever conclusions criticism may demand. The application of the most rigorous methods of research, according to the author, upon the *historical*, while it may seriously affect the traditional views represented in our creeds, dogma, and our theologies, nevertheless need not impair the really important fact and factor of the reality and worth of the *spiritual*.

Both of these books should be read only by those of our clergy who have a sympathetic understanding and some acquaintance with the really difficult problems connected with historical exegesis, textual criticism and linguistic research. To such, the books will awaken considerable critical reflection. To others, these books may only serve to provoke serious misunderstanding.

VERGILIUS FERM

The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church. By the late Dr. Kaufmann Kohler. Edited with a Biographical Essay by M. G. Enelow. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929. $3.00.

We have before us an interesting work of which the appraisal on the wrapper says, "The book is sure to fascinate all those who are interested in the history and close kinship of these two great religions," i. e. the Christian and the Jewish. All along the first part of the book we were haunted by reminiscences of Lessing's Nathan der Weise, not that there is any similarity of treatment or that this book has borrowed from the great poet-philosopher any facts or materials of treatment, but that the "Leitmotif" of the one suggests that of the other. Dr. Kohler thinks not so much of Nathan's rings as of Ezechiel's two sticks which were to become one in his

hand. He hopes that some day some great seer will arise who will "pronounce the message of reconciliation and reunion of Judaism and Christianity...while rebuilding humanity on the foundation of faith in the one and only God of justice and of love."

The aim surely is an exalted one and worthy of the highest efforts of Christian and Jew; but "we hae oor doots" as to the entire efficacy of the plan here proposed. We are convinced however that the Jew has still to learn the real truth about "Jesus the Jew" and to find in the Christian message the fulfillment of that of old which is more than Jewish. Likewise will the Christian still have to learn how much he is indebted, not only to the Law, the Prophecy and the Wisdom of ancient Israel, but likewise to much that is distinctly Jewish. Upon such a basis of mutual understanding there is a possibility of a closer approach among the theologians of both religions. The book before us is an effort in this direction.

The book is the first publication of the Alumni of the Hebrew Union College, which established a special fund in memory of the late Dr. Kaufmann Kohler, to be devoted to the publication of scholarly works on Judaism. Dr. Kohler, at the time of his death was in the act of revising the manuscript of the book and its present form is the result of a labor of love on the part of Rabbi H. G. Enelow, who of late years became known to Christians by his book *A Jewish View of Jesus*. The editor was therefore perhaps imbued with a congenial mind for this task. We wish however, that Dr. Kohler might have lived to write, as he had intended, some additional chapters on the Mission of the Church and of the Synagogue, for without these the discussions in the book seem to lack that final summarization that would give it unity.

To understand Rabbi Kohler, we bear in mind the course of development that made him what he was. As Enelow says, "The HOLY ONE does not raise a man to leadership without first trying and testing him." This rabbinical saying was very true concerning Dr. Kaufmann Kohler. Born in a family of orthodox Jewish faith and in an environment that should have made him a firm adherent of that persuasion, he encountered doubts during his academic studies that drove him far from the orthodox faith and precipitated him into severe struggles and even persecution before he finally became convinced of the positions of the Jewish Reform. He felt that he was fighting the battles of the Lord and that his life must be given to the quest for truth. For this we honor him, even though we do not agree with his positions. At the time of his death he was universally acknowledged as the foremost exponent of Reform Judaism.

But we have a feeling all through his book, that while formally he accepted some of the extremest positions of modern critical scholarship, he never quite got away from that laborious Jewish lore which had been implanted in him from the early days of child-

hood, for we see him reverting over and again into viewpoints that do not agree with the teachings of the critical school which he follows, but reflect rather the unconscious love for the synagogal teachings from which he had apparently rebelled.

Viewed formally his work is based on an utter rationalization of the Old Testament. This is equally applicable to his approach to the New Testament, so that while he says most beautiful things about Jesus, the Apostle Paul and teachings of the New Testament, his description of the Christian faith is no more that which Christians actually hold, than his statement of the Jewish religion seems to us to be quite that which devout Jews believe and follow. That being the case his middle ground upon which he wishes to see Jew and Christian stand does not seem to afford a firm basis for either one.

Aside from this, the author displays great learning and the utmost familiarity with his subject. He does not enter upon a discussion of certain recent theories of the Synagogue, which, while attracting attention, do not meet with the approval of Jewish scholars. We have no space here for the development of such theories either, but would point out here, that to the author, the Synagogue is truly of religious origin. He says repeatedly in one form or another, that the Synagogue is the outgrowth of a democratic movement in Israel as over against the hierarchical sysetem of the Temple. To him the Synagogue is the creation of the saintly men of ancient Israel, the Hasidim, in contradistinction to the Temple with its sacerdotal functions and personnel.

In the same manner he proceeds to show that what is commonly called Christianity is a modification of what the first Christians believed and taught and which was in fact derived from the same sources as the Synagogue also. He has arrayed vast material of quotations from Biblical, extra-Canonical literature, from the Talmud and other rabbinical writings, so that the book is very informative as to certain aspects of Judaism and therefore valuable to the reader who does not have access to such writings as are here enumerated. On the other hand, the case which he builds up for Christianity is neither in itself convincing, nor is it carried on so fully as in the case of Judaism. On the whole, some of the views presented have been superseded, both as to synagogal matters and still more so as to Christian origins; but the book is even so one of great merit and well worth the study of theologians.

C. T. BENZE

CHURCH HISTORY

Protestantism in the United States. By Archer B. Bass. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1929. 364 pages. $3.00.

The title of this volume would indicate that it is a study of the

history of Protestantism in this country. But it is primarily a discussion of interdenominationalism or interdenominational activities in the United States. Part I considers "Denominationalism in the United States: Its Origin and Development." Part II treats "Interdenominationalism in the United States: Its Problem and Progress." Three chapters—sixty-six pages—are devoted to the origin and development of Protestantism in Europe and America.

One hundred and fifty "sects" are classed as Protestant—all who refuse submission to the claims of the Roman Catholic church being classed as Protestant regardless of their tenets. This makes Protestantism little more than a negative protest against Rome and gives but little consideration to the positive evangelical principles that produced Protestantism. At the same time the classification as separate "sects" of groups that are confessionally agreed but are working under separate organizations because of language or polity seems unwarranted.

Furthermore the treatment of origin and development is too brief to be of much value, and at the same time inaccurate and misleading statements appear. We can call attention to only a few of these. As a cause for division among Protestants, Luther's refusal to shake hands with Zwingli at Marburg is cited. The facts concerning the Marburg Colloquy are not given. Truth and error can not be determined by hand-shaking.

The author says (page 14), "another instance is afforded by the action of the Conference of Augsburg (1530), which, after it had received the Lutheran Confession on June 25th, and Zwingli's personal statement on July 8th, refused even to hear read the oldest Confession of the Reformed Church in Germany—the Tetrapolitan —choosing rather to issue against it a secret Confutation filled with misrepresentations." Thus apparently a conference of "various Protestant groups" is made responsible for what happened at Augsburg and for the Confutation. But as a matter of fact it was a Diet conducted by the Emperor, who was controlled by the Catholics, who refused to receive the Tetrapolitan Confession, as well as that of Zwingli, and ordered the preparation of the Confutation of the Lutheran Confession—the "secret Confutation" of the Tetrapolitan Confession "filled with misrepresentations,"—and then refused a copy to the Lutherans lest they answer it.

On page 38 we read in regard to interpretations of the Lord's Supper: "Luther's transubstantiation, Calvin's consubstantiation." A misrepresentation that is without excuse. On the same page we read that "the Lutherans felt that both the worthy and the unworthy should be invited to it (the Lord's Supper); the Reformed churches held that only believers, who through faith could appropriate its blessings and benefits in a spiritual manner, should be admitted to partake." An unfortunate statement which may leave

the impression that the Lutherans did not require belief in order to partake.

Another statement that is without foundation reads (page 41): "adherence to Arminianism directly accounts in part for the setting up of the...Evangelical Joint Synod of Ohio (Lutheran), and the United Norwegian Synod (Lutheran)."

On page 45 the following appears in the description of Calvinistic development: "The German Reformers set up the Presbyterian system." On page 55 Alexander Campbell is declared to be the father of his father, Thomas Campbell. On page 64 it is said that "Mormonism agrees with other Protestant churches" on the doctrine of the Trinity, which is far from the facts in the case. On the following page the Church of Christ Scientist is classed with the Protestants "because its theories embraced enough of the New Testament teachings to classify it among the Christian churches." The inadequate and inaccurate statements appearing are unfortunate. More unfortunate, it seems, is the manner in which "sects" are classified as Protestant regardless of the content of their teaching and its unevangelical nature.

Chapters IV and V treat of the good and evil respectively in the separations presented in Protestantism. On page 69 we read: "it is now acknowledged that each sect contains only partial elements of the whole truth." But it is not stated which "sect" makes the acknowledgment. On page 98 appears this statement: "The ministers located in towns and villages are woefully lacking in scholastic training." On the following pages the type of church buildings, lack of Sunday school organizations, poorly equipped teachers, and the absence of auxiliary societies are attributed, together with poorly prepared preachers, to denominationalism, while interdenominational co-operation is presented as the cure for all these deficiencies.

Part II traces the efforts at co-operation or interdenominational activities. The material is drawn from questionaires and surveys by the author and others and presents the various methods and types of interdenominational activity and the work of "united" or community churches. This is a resumé of activities along these lines that will be of interest to those who desire to know what has been attempted and accomplished. While the author is convinced that the "united" or community church will help to overcome many of the ills noted, he is forced to the conclusion that "denominational connection contributes to its prosperity....Facts seem to show that the united churches having denominational connection are superior to others and more progressive both in spirit and vision" (pages 194-5). This presentation of interdenominational efforts at co-operation, the methods tried, and the results obtained constitutes that which is of value in the volume.

JOHN B. MOOSE

The Dilemma of Protestantism. By William E. Hammond. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1929. 150 pages. $2.00.

Here is a collection of somewhat loosely joined essays under a title rather artificially applied. The author makes clear some of the conspicuous problems facing twentieth-century Protestantism, although he hardly joins them in such a way as is suggested by the word "dilemma."

The book covers material which is well-known among students of historical and contemporary theology, e. g., the disrupting influence of contradictory Biblical exegeses in historic Protestantism, the similar influence of the *laissez-faire* mood involved in the doctrine of the right of private judgment, the search for new standards of faith, the present humanistic and humanitarian trend, the implications of scientific method, the new cosmogony, and so on.

Two topics, however, come in for suggestive treatment. The first is the significant rôle which the economic factor is at present playing within ecclesiastical households. Young clergymen, the author points out, enter their work with a high idealism and in the spirit of real sacrifice. But faced with the cruel necessity of producing the cold cash in exchange for the goods in the market places, of maintaining in a respectable manner a respectable family, and, seeing some of the brethren in the ministry living comfortably on salaries far in excess of their needs, and beholding the "higherups" enjoying the privileges of travel and wider social contacts and enviable comforts,—these young men lose their first passion of self-sacrifice and enter whole-heartedly with the rest in their share of "advantages." But to do this one must play the game; produce pretentious parish statistics to attract attention; do the bidding of those in power; be a go-getter and keep an eye for possible promotions. "If a minister loses his Christian idealism for disinterested service, it is largely due to the competitive system under which he labors." The Protestant churches must need pay attention to their own economic wrongs before preaching reform to the world at large. We can hardly deny the truth of such a picture in many quarters.

The second topic which is suggestively discussed is the existence on a competitive basis, side by side with the church, of the social service clubs, fraternal organizations, lodges, secret orders, etc. Energies of men (and women) are today fiercely scattered; a good many belong to more organizations than can command their loyalty. The result is that loyalty has come to mean little. Irresponsibility has entered into the very portals of the church. "When whole tracts of society habituate themselves in assuming obligations to which they refuse to be bound, the reaction is felt sooner or later in the realms of morality and religion." "Were men to assume no obligation which knowingly they are unable to keep,

fraternities, no less than the churches, would profit thereby." No man or woman who maintains membership in organizations, however worthy, which duplicate each other can justly criticize the present duplication of effort on the part of the Protestant churches. Those who are heard to decry the churches are often the very ones who contribute to the confusion by their scattered loyalties.

VERGILIUS FERM

The Origins of the World War. By Sidney Bradshaw Fay. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929. Vol. I. Before Sarajevo: Underlying Causes of the War. XVII + 551 pages. Vol. II. After Sarajevo: Immediate Causes of the War. XI + 576 pages. $9.00 the set.

Article 231 of the Treaty of Peace with Germany, signed at Versailles, June 28, 1919, sets forth: "The Allied and Associated Governments affirm and Germany accepts the responsibility of Germany and her allies for causing all the loss and damage to which the Allied and Associated Governments and their nationals have been subjected as a consequence of the war imposed upon them by the aggression of Germany and her allies." This definitely fixed upon Germany and her allies the burden of reparations and placed before the world the victor's interpretation of a great historical event. It is still the judgment underlying the policy of reparations collections, and it determines the attitude of many toward Germany.

But it does not tell the truth and it attempts what is always to be guarded against in the interpretation and assessment of great historical events, namely, it offers too simple an explanation. A world war is a complex affair; the explanation of it must necessarily be complex.

Due to most unusual developments in the political affairs of several important European countries in the years 1917 and 1918, the secret archives of these same countries were opened and the material therein published to the world.

One of the pioneers in the study of this material was our author and he now gives to the public the fruits of ten years and more of critical, unbiased labor. His work has been proclaimed as an epoch-making achievement; one that will serve as a corner stone for the use of other specialists in the field.

The books are well written and well printed but in the nature of the case they are much detailed and sometimes prove trying, especially to one who is himself not a specialist. In fact, such a one can appreciate the work only by constant reference to some standard textbook on Modern European History. But pastors and religious leaders generally, owe it to themselves, the cause of Truth, and the future peace of the world, to understand and appreciate the viewpoint and the conclusions which are here presented.

The author approaches the subject as a scientist concerned to know the truth. He has no axes to grind and he throws no bricks. He has not written the definitive work. Some conclusions will need to be revised in the light of evidence not yet uncovered; some interpretations will doubtless be modified. For the busy general reader there is presented, however, enough of the matter to lead him to an approximately correct point of view.

The work is almost exclusively a study in diplomatic history. For that reason many contributing factors such as business interests, colonial dreams, jingo literature, etc., are not presented adequately as creating the war and all that it meant. Yet in the diplomacy, and the records of that diplomacy, in the activities of a hundred professional diplomats, is contained the essential explanation of *why the war came and how.*

Volume I deals with the underlying causes of the war before the fateful day, June 28, 1914, when the Arch-Duke Franz Ferdinand, heir to the Austrian Imperial Throne, was shot to death in the streets of Sarajevo, the capital city of the province of Bosnia. These causes are traced back to 1871, the close of the Franco-Prussian War. They are grouped as follows: the system of secret alliances, militarism, nationalism, economic imperialism, and the newspaper press. These are discussed as the results are reflected in European diplomacy. Volume II deals with the events between June 28, 1914, and Aug. 5, 1914. Here a very careful study has been made of all available materials in order to show the development as it proceeded from peace to war, in 38 days. Obviously, this volume is highly detailed. Aug. 5 marked the entrance of England into the war. Prof. Fay's investigations have been limited to this point.

ROBERT FORTENBAUGH

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

Sacraments. By A. L. Lilley, Canon Residentiary of Hereford. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929. 159 pages. $1.50.

Professor Lilley's immediate purpose in this book is to give a summary of Christian thought about the sacraments. His method of making this survey is by "a study of some moments" of sacramental thought, that is to say, by analyzing the positions of certain outstanding theologians, and showing the progress from one viewpoint to another. He especially emphasizes the change from regarding the sacraments as symbols of divine reality (Hugh of St. Victor) to regarding them as God's instruments (St. Thomas Aquinas), and thence to the necessity of faith in receiving the sacraments (Reformation).

This is, however only the particular purpose of the book. Pro-

fessor Lilley is seeking to establish also a general thesis, that theology is necessary to spiritualize religion and religious practice: to keep them from the excesses of emotion, literalism, magic. He makes use here of one phase of religion, the sacraments, to enforce his main contention. He holds up the theologizing of Augustine or Thomas as an intellectual attempt to keep sacramental grace from being degraded to magic or coarse materialism; or, more generally, to keep religion spiritual.

Professor Lilley challenges admiration in another respect, I think, namely, his fine appreciation of the older theologians, their Aristotelian background, encyclopedic content, masterful logic, incisive reflection, coupled with an equal appreciation of the revolutionary changes in modern thought, and the new *Weltansicht* in which theology must find its bearings today. We have in this country many students who appreciate one point of view or the other; but apparently it is only on the other side of the Atlantic that they have cultivated a sympathetic grasp of both the older contributions and the newer necessities.

The book is therefore of decided interest as a study in theological theory and method. It is perhaps somewhat less successful in presenting any appreciable help toward a devotional understanding of the sacraments themselves.

THEODORE K. FINCK

Christian Symbolics. By E. H. Klotsche, A.M., Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Exegesis and Symbolics in the Western Theological Seminary, Fremont, Nebraska. Burlington, Iowa: The Lutheran Literary Board, 1929. 400 pages. $3.50.

The reader of *Christian Symbolics* can scarcely fail to be impressed with the large amount of invaluable material which is placed at his disposal. There are 400 large, closely printed pages, with an adequate index. The author and publishers are to be congratulated upon the volume's excellent format, clear print, and careful proofreading (in spite of an awkward misplaced line on page 336).

The author has not outlined his subject by doctrines, but by faiths; this has some disadvantages, but leaves a single impression of each group. It also enables Dr. Klotsche to include a description of the cultus, customs, polity, subdivisions, and even statistics of each faith, all of great value for reference.

The book, after introductory pages on symbols in general, and the ecumenical creeds, gives a comprehensive chapter to the Greek Catholic church; then another, with even more detail, to the Roman church. This chapter is written with considerable denunciation of the "shocking errors held by the Romanists" (p. 80). But I believe that we no longer say that Rome teaches "justification and

salvation by work-righteousness" (p. 59; see 82f.): this is an over-statement. "The guilt and the eternal punishment are remitted to the [Roman Catholic] penitent for the sake of the atoning merits of Christ," says Dr. H. E. Jacobs in his lectures on Symbolics (mimeographed notes, p. 44). There is an interesting discussion in this chapter of the Catholic conception of prayer (p. 87f.).

The next chapter (IV) gives a good familiar summary of the doctrines of the Lutheran church, emphasizing justification by faith, the nature of Christ, the sacraments. The tone of censure gives way to uncritical approval of everything.

The Reformed church comes next. I found of unusual interest the section on God (p. 206 ff.), with its appealing, hideous statement of unrelieved predestination (supra-lapsarian); and that on the dualism of Calvin which led him to contemn the human body (p. 214).

After short chapters on the Anglican communion (VI) and Socinianism and Arminianism (VII), Dr. Klotsche devotes the last 130 pages to the "Modern Protestant Denominations and Sects." This is an engrossing section. It is more freshly written than the preceding chapters, pulsating with the life of recent times in our own land. The activity, hopes, and teachings of group after group pass before one's eyes: sixteen bodies of Baptists, twenty-one of Methodists, ten of Presbyterians, thirteen of Mennonites; Hard Shells, Shakers, Irvingites, Dunkers, Darbyites, River Brethren, Yorker Brethren, Campbellites, Winebrennerians, Black Jews, Come-Outists, Holiness Bands, Church of Daniel's Band, Pillar of Fire, Thomasites, Dowieites, and what not; Old Light Presbyterians, Republican Methodists, Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Baptists, Quakers, Swedenborgians, Adventists, Russellites, Mormons, Christian Scientists. These, and many many more, pass in review, a fascinating story of zeal, devotion,... selfishness, bigotry. I have never seen a more complete or enthralling survey of American religious groups.

With reference to the book as a whole, I may make three further comments. First, the author is not always clear and systematic in arranging and developing his outlines. Frequently his material is presented in a haphazard fashion that would make it difficult for a student to grasp and retain the details. I might cite in illustration the treatment of Swedenborgian doctrine (pp. 318-322), where one paragraph of over three solid pages includes the whole system of teachings.

Second, Dr. Klotsche, especially in the first part of the book, has done nothing to make Christian doctrine intelligible to the mind of today. We need to realize that at least to the person not trained in theology many points once eagerly debated are futile and meaningless. Quarrels over man's nature before the Fall, zealously

elaborated here (p. 215 f.), have lost significance. And when one has heard a spiritual, helpful sermon preached by a Lutheran woman (as I have), the long paragraph (p. 293) which condemns the "unscriptural practice" of permitting "women publicly to teach in the Church," seems a little medieval.

Third, the author's attitude toward non-Lutheran teachings is rather indefensible. "Everything I say is right, everything you say is wrong"—that expresses his outlook. There is no effort to be impartial, to see the other denomination's angle, to recognize the contribution that each may make to the understanding of the Bible. Dr. Klotsche, bewailing the many sects, is himself sectarian in point of view.

In an interesting concluding page (399) he says: "Such is divided Christendom—by schisms rent asunder, by heresies distressed. No Christian can study the divisions in the church without deeply deploring them and profoundly feeling the need of unity among Christians." Yet he seems painfully unconscious that it is just the attitude of claiming infallibility for one's own interpretations that perpetuates disunion. He continues: "There can be no compromising with error.... 'Search the Scriptures.'... What our Fathers [the author's capitalization] solemnly declared... is our declaration today:... 'We also have determined not to depart even a finger's breadth from the subjects themselves, or from the phrases which are found in them (the Confessions)....' Here we stand, we cannot do otherwise; God help us! Amen." These closing words advocate the precise principle which has lain back of almost all of Christianity's schisms.

Dr. Klotsche himself gives us an extreme illustration of this in a split among the River Brethren (p. 342). In the ceremony of foot-washing it had always been customary for one person to wash the feet and another to dry them. But in 1853 some thought it would be more *biblical* (John 13:5) for the same person both to wash and to dry the feet. So they separated, and called themselves *United* Zion's Children! Unless we are willing to approach the Scriptures openmindedly, regarding the opinions of others and ourselves as mutual suggestions in the search for complete truth, we must bear our particular part of the blame for continuing schisms and thwarting the Master's prayer "that they all may be one."

THEODORE K. FINCK

What Ought I to Believe? By John A. W. Haas. Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, 1929. 91 pages. $0.75.

This book is an apologetic in behalf of "the ruling presuppositions and beliefs of evangelical faith." The approach, here set forth, to the question of *what* Christians should believe, is funda-

mentally sound (although perhaps partial) and will hardly, as such, be criticized by those who today are vigorously challenging traditional beliefs. We are morally bound, the author maintains throughout, to accept those traditional beliefs which have ethical significance and value. "The fundamental character of the Christian faith when rightly apprehended is always ethico-religious"; "to justify our beliefs we must inquire into their ethical outcomes." If this be true, it would seem to follow that any view which does not issue in ethical meanings must either be regarded as unessential or else necessarily be sloughed off.

In the light of this approach, the author treats (all too briefly) such doctrines which he believes can and ought to be defended and maintained, e. g., theism; Trinity; supernaturalism; theodicy; creationism; incarnation; atonement; authority of the Bible; personal immortality, etc.

The doctrine of the Trinity, it is suggested, has suffered through metaphysical speculations; it would have fared better if the "ethical oneness" had been stressed, viz., "the agreeing and differing operations of Father, Son and Spirit upon human lives." But, just *how* this particular doctrine, as such, has ethical value the author does not say. His case for a theistic belief is, however, more adequately set forth. Again, just how one is justified on moral grounds to appeal to a metaphysical Satan as somehow responsible for evil, is not clear. Such an appeal pushes the problem, it would seem, so far back as to be beyond ethical significance from the human point of view. Nothing is said about that vexatious problem of physical evil. Again, just how some of the traditional theories of the atonement can be defended on moral grounds (which is so much disputed in modern theology) is not clear, even though the author seems to approve the feudal theory of Anselm and of the ransom theory in a modified form. The moral-influence theory of Peter Abelard is practically restated (pp. 67-68), although none of the historic theories are mentioned by name.

His discussion of "the authority of faith" is very well done and convincing. "The claims of a mechanically infallible Bible, verbally perfect, do not hold in the light of the facts." The Word of God is identified with the spiritual content of the Bible (p. 30). Genesis is rightly conceived to have great value in spite of "the non-scientific account of creation" therein contained. The argument for personal immortality follows in general the well-known Kantian theory of "ultimate ethical harmony." The statement, however, that "the fundamental presupposition of all religions is the existence of a supernatural world beside the present natural world" would be severely criticized by many students of the philosophy of religion as a too exclusive conception of religion. His attack on evolutionary naturalism is at many points justifiable; yet, to couple fatalism (p. 52) with this view would be most vigor-

ously resented by such a well-known protagonist of this philosophy as Professor R. W. Sellars. (Cf. *The Principles and Problems of Philosophy*, Part III).

To the ethical criterion set forth in this book, would it not be well to add another, viz., that of reasonableness? May there not be certain religious beliefs which, though issuing in no ethical meanings, ought nevertheless to be held because such are convincing and critically valid? It does seem that the author applies this last test unconsciously throughout in spite of his insistence upon the moral criterion as the *sine qua non* of religious beliefs.

Such a book as President Haas has here presented is a step in the right direction toward a modern Christian apologetic.

VERGILIUS FERM

A Preface to Morals. By Walter Lippmann. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929. 348 pages. $2.50.

Taking the Name of Science in Vain. By Horace J. Bridges. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929. 273 pages. $2.50.

Beyond Agnosticism, a Book for Tired Mechanists. By Bernard Iddings Bell. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1929. 170 pages. $2.00.

These three books are grouped together for review because they all deal with the same situation, though they are led by it to entirely different solutions. All recognize that the religious and moral sanctions of the ages are being challenged in our day. Their authority is being questioned and, in not a few cases, denied.

A Preface to Morals acknowledges that these religious and moral sanctions have rendered a real service to mankind, and that, if they are to be abandoned, something must be found to take their place. In justice to the author it should be said that he treats with respect those to whom religious authority still makes its appeal. There is no attempt to destroy their faith. The book is not however written for this class. It addresses itself to those—and their number is all too great and constantly growing—who no longer recognize the obligations of religion or of morality. To these he would recommend as the solution what he designates as "high religion" (Chapter X). This he finds in "that cultivation of disinterestedness which renders passion innocent and an authoritative morality unnecessary" (p. 209). Disinterestedness seems to be the key word in the solution. "The insight of high religion into the value of disinterestedness will, if pursued resolutely, untangle the moral confusion of the age" (p. 230). It would urge that men have no prejudice in favor of any ideals or values, that they accept things as they are no matter what hopes may be shattered thereby. The only God and the only norm for men would be what makes for the most complete harmony with one's environment at

each stage of life. We come to our present substitute for Deity—that which is known as integration. One may point out that this part of the author's solution can be only with difficulty reconciled with complete disinterestedness.

We have in disinterestedness the Buddhist solution of pre-Christian times. In Hinduism it finds classic expression in the Bhagavadgita. Do everything without desire, it says. Buddha evolved his philosophy of life, in part at least, to escape from the satiety that the luxury of a court produced. One wonders as he reads this book whether, if it makes an appeal, it is not to that same jaded spirit of an overprosperous America. It does not appeal to us, among other reasons, because it has already failed in the Buddhist lands of the East.

Taking the Name of Science in Vain is the solution offered to us by the leader of the Chicago Ethical Society. His answer we have in the form of four lectures delivered in Philadelphia on the Jayne Foundation. These are on the Meaning of Life and its Values, the Reality and Limits of Personal Responsibility, Rationality, Liberty and License in Literature, and Civic Rights and Duties. The arguments for man's freedom and accountability could hardly be more cogently put than they are in these lectures. Though the author limits himself to a defense of the moral sanctions that have come down to us and argues that to deny these in the name of science is to take its name in vain, it is rather difficult to understand why he fails to see that the sanctions of religion stand on exactly the same footing as do those of morals. The solution here is a decided advance on that in the *Preface to Morals* but it does not go far enough.

After reading these attempts at solutions, it is reassuring to the believer to read a book of testimony such as the one that Bernard Iddings Bell has given us in *Beyond Agnosticism, a Book for Tired Mechanists.* Some of the chapters in this book have already appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly.* The writer betrays here and there his decided inclination towards the Anglo-Catholic position which makes him in some incidental phrases to do scant justice to most of the forms of Protestantism. But this need not blind one to the pre-eminently better solution that he offers in a return to faith in God and to the practices of religion both in worship and in life.

Such solution is not as rare among men now as the other books mentioned above might lead one to suppose. We quote here the author's own statement of this fact: "Today, if you wish to find the mystics, the safest place to look is among the leaders in the laboratories. Not that you will find there those mooney souls who talk about 'the religion of science' or the naturalizing of the supernatural. Those are phrases confined to demi-educated ecclesiastics. *There is no religion in science.* Scientists know that. They insist upon it. But there is religion in men, which is why science

can never adequately explain men. Most of the greater scientists know that quite well. Because they know it, they tend, to a degree startling to scientific laymen, to be mystics.... They are like the eminent physiologist who at a dinner in New York last winter said: 'I am tired of fundamentalists who believe that we scientists know nothing; and more tired of modernists, who think that we scientists know everything. Why do churches bother about *us* so much? It is in what they know, or ought to know that I am interested. They are the custodians of an ages-old experience, the experience of what to scientists is forever unknowable. Why do they not speak and reveal what the race has discovered?' "

The author in this book tells us forcibly what he has discovered. It gives his solution. To one who shares in his experiences, the solution is the only satisfying one. Could even those who do not have the experience do better than to read these solutions and compare them? Such reading has led to a most interesting and profitable study for the reviewer.

JOHN ABERLY

With and Without Christ. By Sadhu Sundar Singh. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1929. 152 pages. $1.50.

Sadhu Sundar Singh gives this new message to the world. He writes of non-Christians whom he has met and contrasts those who are with and those who are without Christ. Then, in true Pauline style (Rom. 2), he contrasts professed Christians who are without Christ with those who are real followers of Christ. This is for Christians the most heart-searching portion of the book. He concludes with a testimony to what life was for the Sadhu himself without Christ and what it is for him with Christ. "Without Christ I was like a fish out of water, or like a bird in the water. With Christ I am in the ocean of Love and, while in the world, am in heaven (Eph. 2:5, 6)" (pp. 136-7). This book presents the evidence from experience in one of the most Paul-like Christians of our day. Its deeply spiritual tone, which is characteristic of all the Sadhu's messages, makes it even more a manual of devotion.

JOHN ABERLY

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

Altar Stairs. By Joseph Fort Newton. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928. xi + 205 pages. $1.75.

What do the so-called "modernists" offer in a constructive way to the training of a genuinely devotional type of living so characteristic of effective religion and so intimately bound up with real Christianity, is a query which many may legitimately and seriously

be raising. One answer is to be found in this small volume of 131 brief prayers by a well-known churchman of the liberal school of religious thinking. This book is an unmistakable refutation of the charge made by thoughtless critics that all modernism is destructive. The whole book breathes the air of the reality of the spiritual and contains prayers that are certainly Christian both in character and spirit.

It is very significant that many books of the devotional type are appearing from men of the liberal stamp: Fosdick's *The Meaning of Faith* and *The Meaning of Prayer;* J. H. Oldham's *A Devotional Diary;* W. A. Brown's *The Quiet Hour* and *The Life of Prayer in a World of Science;* Weigle and Tweedy's *Training of the Devotional Life;* and, lately, Wieman's *Private Methods of Religious Living*, to mention only a few at random. If anything characterizes the drift of contemporary religious thinking represented by the constructive wing of the liberal group, it is the wholesome return to religious mysticism. With this new emphasis it is most natural to expect important contributions to the field of devotional literature. Dr. Joseph Fort Newton's book is an indication of this revival and trend.

We offer only this criticism of the book: it seems unduly expensive when one considers its small compass.

VERGILIUS FERM

The Man of Sorrows. By Albert T. W. Steinhauser. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928. 318 pages. $1.75.

Vacation time and early Autumn is the time for the wise leader to prepare for the next Lenten season. We are glad therefore to call attention to the recent publication of the second edition of the above exceedingly valuable book of devotions on the passion of our Lord. The plan of the book, if you are not familiar with it, follows the successive days of Lent in order.

"The peculiar combination in *The Man of Sorrows* of (1) a short introit or opening versicles, (2) the Scripture passage, (3) an exposition of it in simple direct language, (4) a meditation in the tradition of Augustine and à Kempis, (5) prayers, collects, and litanies from many sources, some of which appear for the first time in English, (6) a sacred poem or hymn from ancient or modern writers, and (7) a closing benediction, develops exceptional power to rouse the reader's capacity for penitence and awe and sustain their exercise at the highest pitch."

If you do not already have this book you will become richer in its purchase and use. It is one of the books that should have a very large circulation and use among the laity as well as the ministry.

H. D. HOOVER